National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XVII. NO. 16. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1856. WHOLE NO. 848.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, 138 *Nassau St., New York,*

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

31 *North Fifth St., Philadelphia.*

Advertisements inserted at $1 per square for the first insertion and 25 cents for every subsequent one. For advertisements less than a square, 50 cents for each insertion.

NORRIS & JOHNSTON, PRINTERS.

Pro-Slavery.

THE MODEL DEMOCRAT.

[The *Richmond Enquirer*, under the head of "A Record without a Blemish," gives the following list of Mr. Buchanan's votes in Congress on questions relating to slavery. It is as "clean a bill of health" as any other public man in the world could present; and, it is said, no detraction can be made from it except that thirty-seven years ago, in his hot inconsiderate youth, this model Democrat was so weak as to sign a call to the citizens of Lancaster to protest against the admission of Missouri as a slave State. But that early folly, if generally known, is doubtless forgiven.]

1. In 1836, Mr. Buchanan supported a bill to prohibit the circulation of Abolition Papers through the mail.

2. In the same year he proposed and voted for the admission of Arkansas.

3. In 1836–7 he denounced and voted to reject petitions for the Abolition of Slavery in the District of Columbia.

4. In 1837 he voted for Mr. Calhoun's famous resolutions, defining the rights of the States and the limits of Federal authority, and affirming it to be the duty of the Government to protect and uphold the institutions of the South.

5. In 1838, 1839 and 1840, he invariably voted with Southern Senators against the consideration of Anti-Slavery petitions.

6. In 1844–5, he advocated and voted for the Annexation of Texas.

7. In 1847, he sustained the Clayton Compromise.

8. In 1850, he proposed and urged the extension of the Missouri Compromise to the Pacific Ocean.

9. But he promptly acquiesced in the Compromise of 1850, and employed all his influence in favour of the faithful execution of the Fugitive Slave Jaw.

10. In 1854 he remonstrated against an enactment of the Pennsylvania Legislature for obstructing the arrest and return of fugitive slaves.

11. In 1854 he negotiated for the acquisition of Cuba.

12. In 1856 he approves the repeal of the Missouri restriction, and supports the principles of the Kansas-Nebraka Act.

13. He never gave a vote against the interests of slavery and never uttered a word which could pain the most sensitive Southern heart.

The prominent facts of Mr. Buchanan's record touching slavery are thus grouped into a single view; so that the person of the least patience in research may ascertain at a glance how the Democratic candidate stands in respect to the great issue of the canvass. In this succinct statement, we give not detached passages and isolated acts, but we bring the whole history of a long life to bear upon the popular mind with the irresistible force of truth. This rapid retrospect discloses a consistency and an efficiency of service to the South which flattery can claim for no other living man. Mr. Buchanan is not only vindicated from calumny; he is not simply shown to be exempt from just reproach and worthy of confidence; he is promoted to his proper position in advance of any and every statesman of the North, in the confidence and affection of the people of the South. He demands not a mere recognition of his attachment to the Constitution, but unbounded applause for such service in the interest of the South as no other man can boast. Against the captious criticism of a desperate adversary, refining upon distinctions and skulking among quibbles, the Democracy oppose this incontestible attestation of their candidate's fealty.

THE SOUTHERN PROGRAMME.

THE New Orleans *Delta* of the 20th inst. publishes the following as its platform, upon which to array a grand Southern working party:

1. We are about to create a Southern opinion, "racy of the soil," and altogether free from every taint of Massachusetts cant.

2. We are about to educate our children in Southern institutions exclusively, and bring them up in pious horror of the sneaking cowardice which preaches non-resistance, while it supports for the Presidency a man whose only claim to the office depends upon his achievements in the field of battle.

3. We are about to exterminate, if we can, the tribe of idiots and knaves who would reduce the white Caucasian race to servitude for the purpose of giving a liberty to the African labourer which his natural conformation prevents him from appreciating or using to any real advantage.

4. We are about to treat the secret and subtle emissaries of Northern hate, the disseminators of poisonous principles, as the booksellers Strickland & Upson were recently treated in Mobile; in other words, we are about, with all due politeness and gravity, to turn them out.

5. We are about to get our school teachers from the South, and to overhaul our school books, so that there will be less of Bunker Hill buncombe and more of Jackson and Calhoun in their pages.

6. We are about to keep our Southern population at home, to resist absenteeism with all our sinews and strength, and allow the St. Nicholas Hotel, the Astor House, the Metropolitan and your other public institutions, to support themselves.

7. We are about to liberate ourselves from the commercial tyranny of the North, and endeavour to establish manufactories, direct trade and foreign relations of our own.

8. We are about to extend our territory and facilitate immigration to those portions of it which require it most; to absorb Mexico; to populate Central America; to filibuster Cuba, and to reclaim California, which was so disgracefully lost to the South by the Compromise measures of 1850.

9. We are about to root out every trace of Massachusetts or New York policy from social and politicall ife—to assert the liberty of thought, of speech and of worship, now utterly unknown in the North, and to revive the liberality as well as the chivalry of the revolutionary days.

10. We are about to bear no more Northern insolence. Wherever or whensoever we encounter it; to defy and denounce it, and even Sumnerize it (with or without a gutta percha cane), if such Sumnerization is rendered necessary by the circumstance.

Lastly, we are about to be free.

LIGHT ON THE KANSAS QUESTION.

UNDER this head the Missouri *Democrat* publishes the following circular, issued as long ago as March last, during a time of comparative peace and quiet in Kansas. It throws much light on the origin of disturbances which have now grown to frightful proportions, threatening the peace of the nation at large:

OFFICE LAFAYETTE KANSAS EMIGRATION SOCIETY,
Lafayette Co., Mo., March 25, 1856.

To the People of the Southern States.

On the undersigned, managers of the "Lafayette Emigration Society," has devolved the important duty of calling the attention of the people of the slaveholding States to the absolute necessity of immediate action on their part, in relation to the settlement of Kansas Territory. The crisis is at hand. Prompt and decisive measures must be adopted, or farewell to Southern rights and independence.

The western Counties of Missouri have, for the last two years, been heavily taxed, both in money and time, in fighting the battles of the South. Lafayette County, alone, has expended more than $100,000 in money, and as much, or more, in time. Up to this time, the border Counties of Missouri have upheld and maintained the rights and interests of the South, in this struggle unassisted, and not unsuccessfully. But the Abolitionists, staking their all upon the Kansas issue, and hesitating at no means, fair or foul, are moving heaven and earth to render that beautiful Territory not only a "free State," so called, but a den of negro-thieves and "higher law" incendiaries.

Missouri, we feel confident, has done her duty, and will still be found ready and willing to do all she can, fairly and honourably, for the maintenance of the integrity of the South. But the time has come when she can no longer stand up, single-handed, the lone champion of the South, against the myrmidons of the entire North. It requires no great foresight to perceive that if the "higher law" men succeed in this crusade, *it will be but the commencement of a war upon the institutions of the South, which shall continue until slavery shall cease to exist in any of the States, or the Union be dissolved.*

How, then, shall these impending evils be avoided? The answer is obvious. *Settle the Territory with emigrants from the South.* The population of the Territory, at this time, is about equal; as many Pro-Slavery settlers as Abolitionists; but the fanatics have emissaries in all the free States—in almost every village—and by misrepresentation and falsehood, are engaged in collecting money and enlisting men to tyranize over the South. Is it in the nature of Southern men to submit without resistance, to look to the North for their laws and institutions? We do not believe it! If, then, the South is influenced by a spirit of self-respect and independence, *let Societies be formed to assist emigrants.* Those who cannot emigrate can contribute money to assist those who can. We have such Societies in Missouri, and we can induce more people to emigrate than we are able to support. If the whole South would adopt this system we would succeed; Kansas would be a slave State, and the slavery agitation would cease. If we permit the North to make an Abolition State of Kansas, the whole South must submit to be governed by the North. Will the South help us?

The great struggle will come off at the next election, in October, 1856, and unless the South can at that time maintain her ground, all will be lost. We repeat it, the crisis has arrived. The time has come for action—*bold, determined action*—words will no longer do any good—we must have men in Kansas; and that too by tens of thousands. A few will not answer. If we should need 10,000, and lack one of that number, all will count nothing. Let all, then, who can come, do so at once. Those who cannot come, must give their money to help others to come. There are hundreds of thousands of broad acres of rich land, worth from $5 to $20 per acre, open to the settlement and preëmption, at $1.25 per acre. Let, then, the farmer come and bring his slaves with him. There are now 1,000 slaves in Kansas, whose presence there strengthens our cause. Shall we allow these rich lands and this beautiful country to be overrun by our Abolition enemies? We know of a surety that they have emissaries and spies in almost every town, village and city in the South, watching our movements, and tampering with our slaves. Let us, then, be vigilant and active in the cause; we must maintain our ground. The loss of Kansas to the South will be the death knell of our dear Union.

Missouri has done nobly, thus far, in overcoming the thousands who have been sent out by Abolition Aid Societies; we cannot hold out much longer unless the whole South will come to the rescue. We need men; we need money; send us both, and that quickly. Do not delay; come as individuals, come in companies, come by thousands.

Our hearts have been made glad by the late arrival of large companies from South Carolina and Alabama. They have responded promptly to our call for help. The noble Buford is already endeared to our hearts; we love him, we will fight for him, and die for him and his companions. Who will follow his noble example? We tell you now, and tell you frankly, that unless you come quickly, and come by thousands, we are gone. The elections once lost, are lost forever. Then farewell to our Southern cause, and farewell to our glorious Union. We repeat the cry, "Come over and help us."

W. H. RUSSELL, MARTIN SLAUGHTER,
O. ANDERSON, G. W. BAKER,
EDWARD WINDSOR, NATHAN CORDER,
WM. SHIELDS.

Selections.

LETTER FROM GERRIT SMITH.

PETERBORO, August, 15, 1856.

MR. WILLIAM GOODELL, New York—*My dear Sir:* Your letter is before me. You would have me publicly contradict the reports that I intend to vote for Col. Fremont. But what is my vote more than any other man's vote? And how can I speak publicly of it without being, or at least appearing to be, conceited? For nothing do I regret these reports more than for the necessity which they seem to lay me under to reply to them.

It is true that I desire Col. Fremont's success against Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Buchanan. And why should I not? His private character is as fair as theirs. I am glad that in this respect they are all unexceptionable. His talents are of a high order. If not as high as theirs, they are nevertheless such as eminently fit him for both civil and military rule. Is he inferior to them in learning? He probably is—for, compared with them, he is a young man. But young as he is, he has given ample proofs of sound scholarship and broad knowledge. Is it thought necessary that the President should be a Protestant? I see not why it should be. With me it is all one whether the candidate is a Roman Catholic or a Protestant, a foreigner or a native. But Col. Fremont *is* a Protestant—and the lie to the contrary is as base and naked a lie as was ever manufactured by lying politicians. Has Col. Fremont done less than Mr. Buchanan or Mr. Fillmore for his country? He has done much more—and I love to see it awaken the enthusiastic gratitude of his countrymen. Not to be grateful for what his unsurpassed enterprise, energy and hardihood have accomplished would betray a strange insensibility to uncommon merit.

For many years the public mind has been aroused to the evils of intemperance, land-monopoly, and slavery. There are passages in Col. Fremont's military history which prove his appreciation of the principles of temperance; and his "expeditions were conducted on temperance principles." For aught I know, Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Fillmore are also the friends of temperance. Col. Fremont openly advocates one of the great measures of the land-reformers—the free distribution of the public lands among the landless. But I am not aware that either Mr. Fillmore or Mr. Buchanan does so. In regard to slavery, Col. Fremont speaks altogether differently from his rivals. They in a way to please the South, and he in a way to displease it. They in a way to offend the North, and he in a way to gratify it. Col. Fremont says that he is "inflexibly opposed to its extension on this continent beyond its present limits." Were Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Fillmore to say as much, or anything like as much—indeed were it not known, that they would permit its extension—they would neither of them get one electoral vote in all the slave States. As it is, Col. Fremont will not get one in those States. Happily, on the other hand, he will probably get all the electoral votes of all the Northern States and perhaps of California also.

And now to return to my voting. The candidate is rare for whom I feel at liberty to vote. In 1844 I desired Mr. Clay's success against Mr. Polk—but I could not vote for him. In 1848 I wished Mr. Van Buren to get a greater vote than either General Cass or General Taylor—but I could not vote for him. In 1852 I should have rejoiced to see my esteemed friend John P. Hale come out ahead of both General Scott and General Pierce—nevertheless, as he held that slavery is law, I could not vote even for him. And now in 1856, I shall probably vote for no Presidential candidate. Related as they are to the question of slavery, I certainly cannot vote for either Mr. Buchanan or Mr. Fillmore. Nor can I well vote for the Abolition candidate, since he is myself. By the way the Abolitionists richly deserve to lose my vote for their candidate, were it only to punish them for nominating him against his strong remonstrances, and for setting him up so often to be maligned and laughed at. Other Abolitionists should be willing to take their turn to be laughed at for getting a few dozen votes out of a few millions, and to be scornfully and angrily dealt with for presuming to be in nomination. Then as to Col. Fremont—although I shall take sincere pleasure in seeing him beat Mr. Buchanan and Mr. Fillmore, it, nevertheless, is not probable that I shall vote for him.

I allow myself to vote for no man who acknowledges slavery to be law. Whether the candidate does or does not agree with me, that there is no slavery in the Federal Constitution, I regard as comparatively immaterial. But if he admits that the highest crime against God and man is capable of being clothed with the obligations and sacredness of law, I cannot vote for him. If he so far confounds wrong with right as to admit the legality of slavery; if he has such false views of law as to admit that it can extend its protection over the most sweeping piracy; and if his ear is so heavy that he cannot hear in the voices of reason and religion their sentence of outlawry against slavery—then I cannot vote for him. Now, fearing that Col. Fremont does, in common with the great mass of anti-slavery men, regard enactments and decrees for slavery as law—real, valid, obligatory law; and fearing too that, notwithstanding he has all the teachableness of an honest man, he can hardly be educated out of this depth of error in the short time that remains before the election—I consequently fear that I shall not be able to vote for him. Let me add, in this connection that, although my fellow candidates will surpass me in votes, I shall have the consolation of knowing that my relation toward them was more humane and Christian than theirs toward me. To explain—were I elected, and were one of them to fall under the yoke of slavery during my Presidency, I should know no law for his slavery; but I would know all law against it. Wherever he might be, whether in one of the Barbary States or in one of the Southern States, I would wield the powers of my great office to deliver him. I could not desire the President's office, nor the Governor's office, should I not carry with me the determination to save, God helping me, from the clutches of slavery every subject of the Government I had been called to administer. Thus would I deal with my fellow-candidates. But, alas for me, were I to become a Southern slave during Mr. Fillmore's Presidency! He would hold me tight: and if I should make out to run away, he would not refuse to tender to my pursuing masters the whole American army and navy. He once tendered them in a similar case; and surely he is too impartial to be more merciful to one runaway slave than to another. And what reason is there to believe that I should fare better at the hands of Mr. Buchanan? None. Moreover, would not Col. Fremont take the side of my oppressor? He certainly would, unless he had escaped from the delusion that slavery is law. I believe that he will yet escape from it.

How slow are even wise men to understand civil government! They should not be. For the principles of government in the State or political family are all one with its divine principles in the literal family. Despotism is confounded with Government. There may be any amount of slavery under Despotism—but there can be none under Government. The ruler who suffers slavery within his jurisdiction is a despot. It is not Government that he administers.

I said that I would endeavour to deliver my fellow-candidate from the torments of slavery. But would he not, from being accustomed to reverence slavery as law, have scruples against such deliverance, and refuse to accept it? Oh no! oh no!! But, in his deep and unendurable affliction, he would pray Heaven that I might not honour slavery as law, and that I might trample it under foot as no law. Now, just as he would have me do toward himself, should he be willing to do toward the millions of his enslaved countrymen; and just so *would* he do toward them were they suddenly to become Anglo-Saxons. After such a magical transformation, there would be no longer any recognised law for slavery; and the fact that our statesmen would scout the idea of the possibility of *legal* white slavery only shows that their claim to have Constitutions and Statutes for slavery regarded as Law for slavery proceeds from no respects for Constitutions or Statutes or Law, but simply from their prejudice against their coloured brethren—but simply from their contempt and hatred of one of the varieties of the human family.

I trust that my words do not imply that the Federal Constitution is pro-slavery. It can bear such a construction only at the expense of all sound and settled principles of interpretation. The Constitution speaks not one word for slavery. It could not speak one word for any crime, and especially for the greatest crime, without speaking expressly, clearly, certainly for it.

I quoted from Col. Fremont to show his strong opposition to the extension of slavery. I have done him injustice if, stopping with that quotation, I have left the impression that he is not opposed to its existence also. He is the enemy of all slavery.

Col. Fremont has probably fallen into the common error of construing efforts against the extension of slavery into efforts against its existence. But it is as idle to hope to kill slavery by attempts to restrain its extension as to undertake to starve a troop of wolves by limiting their range. Only leave the wolves alive, and they will see to it, that the field of their plunder is as wide as they need. Only leave slavery alive, and it will be able to take care of itself, and to extend itself in the face of whatever hinderances. I repeat that you cannot kill slavery by trying to prevent its extension; and I add that you can prevent its extension only by killing it. Our fathers were foolish enough to let slavery live, and to trust in its promise not to cross the Missouri Compromise line. But bargains with slavery are absurd and vain, as would be bargains with a wolf. Slavery is no less greedy, merciless and lawless than the wolf. If the wolf, when hungry for the sheep, would heed no bargains, so slavery, when coveting fresh territory for its desolating march, stops not at a Missouri Compromise line, nor to fulfil any of its bargains. How strange that our Northern statesmen should be still willing to trust slavery, after all their recent experience of its utter and shameless perfidy!

I am called on every day to resign my nomination in favour of Col. Fremont. I did resign it to the Convention that gave it to me; and the Convention unanimously refused to accept the resignation. But how could my being out of the way help Col. Fremont's election? Another person would immediately be put in my place. The Abolitionists would not consent to be without a candidate; for although they do not nominate to elect, they nevertheless believe that to nominate is one efficient means of spreading the knowledge, and hastening the adoption, of their great, and heavenly, and one day triumphant, principles. Again, what is to be feared for Col. Fremont from this handful of uncompromising Abolitionists? It is not probable that they will have electoral tickets except in New York and Ohio; and it is not probable that in either of these States they will cast more than a couple of hundred votes. But I shall be disappointed if Col. Fremont does not get in each of these States tens of thousands of votes more than either of his rivals. Possibly, there will be an Abolition electoral ticket in Illinois. It would get perhaps fifty or a hundred votes. But should it get five thousand, it would not endanger Col. Fremont's success in a State so decidedly Republican.

These few Abolitionists who refuse to vote for Col. Fremont are, after all, to be numbered among the most effective helpers of his election. No other equal number of persons are doing more than they to swell that flood of anti-slavery feeling on which alone Col. Fremont can be carried into the Presidency. Let these Radical Abolitionists be left to ply the public mind with their radical doctrines; and then, whether they shall or shall not vote, or however they shall vote, Col. Fremont will have been a greater gainer, and Mr. Fillmore and Mr. Buchanan will have been great losers, by them.

As you are aware, I do not attach that great importance to the approaching election which so many do. I have come to despair of the peaceful termination of slavery. It must go out in blood. The time for abolishing it at the ballot-box has gone by—never to return. Perhaps it was not too late to do it when the public indignation was excited by the repeal of the Missouri Compromise. That was a poor indignation, however, for the reason that very little repentance was mingled with it. Possibly it was not too late even last Spring to undertake the death of slavery by political action. If at that time our tens of thousands of Abolitionists, moved by the outrages of slavery in Kansas and in Washington, had resolved to hold together and to make an earnest Presidential nomination—a nomination for success—the North might, not impossibly, have been lifted up to the plane, and fired with the zeal, and united in the work, of abolition. But when I saw that all those tens of thousands, with the exception of a few hundred, had, for the sake of identifying themselves with great numbers, fallen down to the policy of identifying themselves with mere anti-slavery, and that too of a very qualified form, I gave up all hope of a bloodless termination of slavery. Such a poor negative thing as anti-slavery can never conquer such a positive and mighty thing as slavery. It is true that anti-slavery has power to excite and chafe the whole South, as the present state of Southern feeling testifies. But this is the extent of its power. It is true that it can keep the South and the North involved in an angry strife with each other. But it can do nothing better. The unfurling of the abolition banner was what alone could end this angry strife; was what alone could appal and subdue the soul of slavery; was what alone could convince the monster that nothing was left him but to compose himself to die. Now, however, that the civil war has already begun and that the struggle for Kansas has wrought up the whole South to such boundless frenzy, it is probably too late, even though the North should take the ground of abolition, to accomplish the peaceful overthrow of slavery. The hot purpose of the South to maintain and extend slavery can be quenched only by blood. Wicked, however, as is this purpose, the North is as much to blame for it as the South, since it is but the natural and necessary outgrowth of the miserable anti-slavery by which the North has so incessantly annoyed and exasperated her. It is easy for a parent to spoil the temper of his child by keeping up a quarrel with it about its disobedience. To have saved its temper, he should have firmly stopped its disobedience. The South would, at this day, have had as good a temper as the North had the North, instead of quarrelling with her slavery, taken it away from her.

I referred to Kansas. A bloody fight for her seems inevitable, unless the North shall decline it. The South will not be found wanting; and, only a few weeks ago, I was pretty sure that the North too would not be found wanting. Perhaps I overrated the North. Perhaps she has lain so long at the feet and under the feet of slavery as to make the recovery of her manhood impossible. It must be confessed that there is but too much reason to fear it, when we see Kansas barred on every side against all emigration from the free States, and yet the spirit of these States rising to no higher pitch of indignation than to resolve to vote against the outrage. Voting, as against voting, is very well; and, for Kansas' sake and the whole nation's sake, I shall be glad to see Col. Fremont's vote exceed Mr. Buchanan's and Mr. Fillmore's. But to wait to vote against guns and swords, that the enemy is now using, is the refuge of cowardice and the play of folly. Perishing Kansas cries day and night for men and money—men and money *now*; and we cruelly mock her with promises of our ballots three months hence, and with promises of a right-minded President seven months hence. But before seven months—yes, and, not improbably, before three months—force will have decided the contest, and given Kansas either to the North or to the South.

I could wish that there were no Presidential election at hand. For then the friends of Kansas would not be diverted from the only means of saving her. If Kansas is lost to freedom, the hopes and fears and cowardice and compromises of those whose anxiety to serve her at the ballot-box blinds them on the only way of saving her will largely account for that loss. It is not uncharitable to add that, with some of these politicians, the anxiety is to serve themselves quite as much as to serve Kansas.

The late speech of our esteemed friend Edward C. Delavan this moment comes to hand. It is not out of place to speak of it here. I would make extended comments upon it were it not that my letter is already long, and were it not, too, that the astonishment and grief with which it has filled me call for few rather than many words. Indeed, absolute silence would best express the state of mind induced by reading it. I will speak briefly on a few parts of it.

1. Mr. Delavan seems to have been drawn to the Know-Nothing party by his expectation that, whilst other parties will be characterized by rum-drinking and bribery, that will be "influenced alone by principle and sound patriotism"! Now, I venture to say that more than three-fourths of all the voters in the free States who abstain from intoxicating drinks belong to the Republican party; and I add, that if it surpasses all others in temperance, and is yet behind any others in moral purity, Mr. Delavan and I have mistaken the effects of temperance, and have made a great mistake in devoting thirty years to its advancement.

2. How amazing, how inexplicable, how painful, that Mr. Delavan should receive as truth, and help send over the country as truth, the utter falsehood that Col. Fremont is a Roman Catholic! Who could have duped the dear man so? And yet who is there that these artful politicians cannot dupe? Heaven defend from them us unguarded ones, if the intelligence and experience of even Edward C. Delavan are not proof against their wiles.

3. Who could have believed Mr. Delavan to be a bigot? and to be so blinded by his bigotry as to see no fitness in a Roman Catholic for civil office? It is a sad omen for our country when men of Mr. Delavan's influential position allow their souls to be shrivelled by the spirit of sectarianism. Judge every man (as every man should be judged) by himself—by what he is—rather than by the creed or character of his Church; and then it will not be difficult to find honest men, and enlightened and self-sacrificing patriots, ay, and precious Christians also, among Roman Catholics and among all sects.

4. Mr. Delavan is to vote for Fillmore and Donelson rather than for Fremont and Dayton! He is to vote for Fillmore, who signed the Fugitive Slave bill and devoted himself, "arm and soul," to its heart-breaking and horrible execution, and not for Dayton, who, in the capacity of Senator in Congress, faithfully opposed the passage of that diabolical bill! He is to vote for Donelson, who wickedly boasts that he owns more than a hundred slaves, rather than for Dayton, who abhors slavery!

5. Among Mr. Delavan's justifications for voting for Mr. Fillmore is, that he finds more anti-slavery in the past of Mr. Fillmore than in the past of Col. Fremont. But if former anti-slavery merit is to decide who is the worthier in regard to slavery, then Mr. Delavan might have made out a much stronger case for Mr. Fillmore than he has done. Why, the time was when Mr. Fillmore could, on the eve of an election, give abundantly satisfying public answers to such public questions as the Abolitionists put to him. Nay, the time was when his sympathies were all with the runaway slaves, and when the Abolitionists who had involved themselves with these poor outraged ones, looked to him as their lawyer. Mr. Delavan can learn all this of his friend Calvin Pepper, Esq., of Albany, who formerly lived in Buffalo. When Mr. Pepper was brought before the Court for his part in promoting the escape of slaves to Canada, how ably and successfully did Mr. Fillmore defend him! Never was one Abolitionist truer to another. Little in those days did Mr. Fillmore anticipate how great and guilty a change of heart awaited him. As blind was he, no doubt, as Hazael himself to the future and abominable workings of ambition.

I said that Mr. Delavan could have made a better case for Mr. Fillmore. So, too, on the same principle of looking only into the remote past, he could have made a worse one for Col. Fremont. The Colonel was born and bred amidst slavery; and very probably it was not until after he had reached manhood, and acquired his characteristic independence of thought, that he saw the true character of slavery, and hated it, and resolved never to be a slaveholder.

But the true question is not what is the past of Mr. Fillmore and Col. Fremont on slavery—but what is their present on that subject. And here we find that, whilst Col. Fremont has outgrown his pro-slavery education, Mr. Fillmore has apostatized from his anti-slavery education; that, whilst Col. Fremont is boldly ascending the anti-slavery ladder, and may, ere long, reach the abolition or top-round, Mr. Fillmore has descended it, and found his home and his hopes among pro-slavery companions and pro-slavery interests. Col. Fremont could not travel through the South without being murdered for his anti-slavery. But were Mr. Fillmore to repeat his Southern visit, he would be as much caressed and feasted for his pro-slavery as he was in his former visit. Every Free State man in Kansas would rejoice in Col. Fremont's election. Every Border Ruffian would rejoice in Mr. Fillmore's. Not a single Abolitionist will vote for Mr. Fillmore. Ninety-nine in a hundred of them will vote for Col. Fremont; and even the hundredth will prefer his election to that of Mr. Buchanan or Mr. Fillmore.

No, we must not decide upon the comparative anti-slavery merits of Mr. Fillmore and Col. Fremont in the light of the past and irrespective of the present. Why, in the light of the past, Mr. Delavan is himself an Abolitionist—an out-and-out Abolitionist. Twenty years ago he joined the American Abolition Society. I remember it all the better, because he did me the honour to say that I had persuaded him to join it. But now (alas for my convert, and for all my honour in his conversion!) his tongue is voluble with the old and oft-repeated objections to abolition. Now he can minister quietness to the guilty conscience of America by reviving the old excuse, that "England fastened slavery on this country." It is true that England permitted slavery here. But it is also true that it would never have been here had it not found a welcome here. And it is also true that whatever part England had in originating American slavery, America, and America only, is responsible for the sin of not terminating it. This early Abolitionist, Mr. Delavan, would now employ us in "the amelioration of slavery." But as well, yes much better, might he commend the amelioration of perjury and forgery and adultery and drunkenness. Crimes are not to be ameliorated, but stopped. Oh, how sad it is to see this good man, who once, in the name of everlasting and uncompromising truth, called for the immediate and unconditional abolition of slavery, now fallen down to the policy of "gradual and prospective" emancipation! Oh, how sad to see this good man in favour of postponing the time when the slave husband and his wife, and when the slave parent and his child, shall be allowed to own each other! But he *is* in favour of it, if he is in favour of postponing the abolition of slavery; for so long as slavery exists, its victims can have no right to husband nor wife; to parent nor child; no right to marry; no right to read the Bible; no right to anything. Accord to the slave a single right, however important or unimportant, and he is no longer a slave. Hence Mr. Delavan prefers to have millions of his countrymen continue to live on in entire destitution of rights. This he prefers to the immediate recognition of their manhood. But why do I assert these things? I have wronged my dear friend in asserting them. I know, indeed, that my assertions are fully warranted by his new position. But do I not also know that the logic of his own good head and heart is directly contrary to the logic of this false position, into which cunning and deceitful politicians, taking advantage of his generous and confiding nature, have drawn him?

6. One of Mr. Delavan's objections to Col. Fremont is that he is "not the true representative of a Free Soil party." Infinitely ludicrous is this concern for the Republican or Free Soil party in one who had just turned his back upon it to join a pro-slavery party. But not less ludicrous is the necessary implication of Mr. Delavan's position and language, that he regards Mr. Fillmore as "the true representative of a free soil party." Strange conceptions of "a free soil party" must he have, who regards the guiltiest of all the guilty servants of the Slave Power as its "true representative."

7. Another of Mr. Delavan's objections to Col. Fremont is that he is a sectional candidate. Let us look into this objection, which is used not only by Mr. Delavan, but by ten thousand others, including even Mr. Fillmore himself. I greatly mistake if we shall not find it to be altogether groundless, and fit only to deceive the superficial and to stimulate prejudice. I admit that Col. Fremont is a sectional candidate; and I also admit that I am sorry for it. It is wrong that he should be a sectional candidate. But is he to blame for it? Not at all. The South makes him a sectional candidate by refusing to vote for him. She regards him as so thoroughly, intensely and efficiently anti-slavery that she will not give him a single electoral vote. There was one way, and only one way, for him to avoid being a sectional candidate. That was to be pro-slavery. Then he would have been supported by both the North and the South—by Southern slaveholders and by Northern doughfaces. Does Mr. Delavan really mean that he would have had Col. Fremont give up his anti-slavery for the sake of getting Southern votes, and of losing the name of a sectional candidate?

But I have not done with this objection. Suppose the Know-Nothings, in a gush of gratitude for his accession to their party, should make Mr. Delavan their candidate for Governor; and suppose that the Abolitionists, despairing of making me President, and wishing to see me *stump the State* against my old friend, should honor me with their Gubernatorial nomination—would we not both be sectional candidates? Certainly. The rum men would be against us, and the temperance men would be for us. Would Mr. Delavan and I have to take to drinking in order to relieve ourselves of the charge of being sectional candidates? No, the rum men, who refused to vote for us, and they only, would be responsible for our being sectional candidates—just as the slaveholding South is responsible for Col. Fremont's being a sectional candidate. It is true that the sectionalism in this case would be only moral, instead of both moral and geographical, as in the other case. But why should the fact, that the men of the rum side or section in morals are geographically intermixed with those of the temperance side or section in morals, leave to Mr. Delavan and myself the right to be candidates; and the fact, that the men of the pro-slavery side or section in morals are chiefly collected in one part of our country, take from Col. Fremont the right to be a candidate? Absurd distinction! His right to be an anti-slavery candidate is, so far as the question of sectionalism is concerned, as perfect as Mr. Delavan's or my right to be a temperance candidate.

But I must stop. I can contemplate this change in my dear friend no longer. My heart aches over it. But it will ache still more if I find that his delusion lasts until the election, and that he actually votes for the unrepentant owner of more than a hundred slaves, and, what is far worse, for the unrepentant signer of the Fugitive Slave bill. Your friend, GERRIT SMITH.

MR. SUMNER'S HEALTH.

Correspondence of The N. Y. Tribune.

SWISSVALE, Saturday, August 23, 1856.

WITH many thousands of Mr. Sumner's friends in Western Pennsylvania, I have long resisted the spirit which impels us all to seek his presence and offer tributes of respect; but it has been almost beyond human endurance to read the reports that are constantly circulated about him. His friends have been informing us that "a gentleman of our acquaintance" has visited Mr. Sumner and found him so and so. Then, "a celebrated physician of Philadelphia" has said so and so. Next, "a well-known clergyman" of somewhere has been with him, and thinks thus and so. One time he has been convalescent and will be about in a couple of weeks; and next, there is great danger of his intellect being forever extinguished. All this sounded mysteriously, and the enemies of the freedom of Congressional debate have taken advantage of this mystery to spread the impression that there was some juggling about it—that he was made to appear ill for political effect. A brutal attack upon him in *The Hollidaysburg Standard* revealed the fact that he was receiving visitors who were far from being friends, and I resolved to go at once and see what it all meant.

I found him at the private residence of Dr. Jackson, whom, with his amiable wife, I have for some years claimed as personal friends; and I remained with them two days to find out the secret of the conflicting accounts of his health. The Rev. Mr. Furness, of Philadelphia, is staying with him; he has been his companion a greater part of the time since he left Washington. He consulted Dr. Wistar, of Philadelphia, who gave it as his opinion that there was serious danger of a chronic congestion of the brain, and recommended Cape May. He went there, and returned to Philadelphia nothing better, when Dr. Wistar insisted upon Alleghany Mountain air; and wishing to avoid the publicity of a hotel, he took lodgings at Dr. Jackson's private residence. The Doctor is a Democrat and most accomplished surgeon, and says he thinks there is blood now settled or congested in the vessels of the membrane which lines the brain-pan, but that with plenty of mountain air, generous diet and exercise it will gradually be absorbed, and he be restored to his full vigour.

For the two days I was there I watched Mr. Sumner closely, bringing to bear upon his case a thirty years' experience of frequent and sometimes long periods of nursing the sick, and think there is ample room for the worst apprehensions of his friends. He rides on horseback, over the roughest mountain paths, twelve or fourteen miles a day, and returns with a good appetite for dinner; but a walk of a quarter of a mile prostrates him very much. Prior to this injury, he was considered the best pedestrian in Washington, and ten or twelve miles was only pleasant exercise to him.

He has all the impatience of ordinary men in illness, or in the prospect of restraint, and assures everybody that he is doing very well, feels very well, is quite strong, and will surely be able to go to Washington in two weeks. Mr. Burlingame assures me, with tears in his eyes, that this is what he always said. Ever since his injury, he has been going to be quite well in two weeks; but when he rises from his chair he takes hold of the table. His gait, at a first glance, appears that of a man of ninety years of age; but, watching him awhile, I felt that it was the very kind of step one takes when creeping through a darkened chamber under the influence of a paroxysm of nervous headache; but he says, with a kind of lofty, incredulous scorn, that his head does not ache! Sometimes he feels a *pressure* on the top of his head, and it appears to hurt him when he walks; but he will be ready to go to Washington in two weeks.

It is a remarkable fact, that I never saw a sick man who was not either going to die in half an hour or would be ready to go to Washington in two weeks.

Mr. Burlingame came on Friday evening, about six o'clock, in company with a gentleman and lady from Philadelphia. He had not before seen Mr. Sumner since the Brooks challenge, and we all sat together until after eleven o'clock. There was so much to be told, and said, and explained. Without any personal resemblance, these two appeared together like father and son; but I could give no idea of their interview, even so much of it as the sacredness of private conversation would permit to be made public, in less than a column, and Mr. Sumner crowds everything from my thoughts just now. When his friends left, he had no disposition to retire, and when he did, slept but one hour. Next morning his pulse was very rapid, but he took his usual morning ride in company with Mr. Burlingame, the doctor and the ladies of the party who wished to go. They returned in a great flow of spirits, and after dinner the Senator from Massachusetts was formally expelled from the library, by a vote of the house. He retired, but did not sleep. By a strong effort I denied myself the gratification of spending Sabbath with him, and came home in the night train, feeling very sadly. I tried to induce him to come down to Swissvale, where the air is scarcely less pure, and the scenery finer than on the mountains, and where he would be as nearly out of the world as he could well be, while near a railroad and telegraph; but he thinks he must go in the other direction—the direction of his duties, to Washington, to settle his affairs there, and then to the stump, to labour in the campaign. For, the issue, the fearful issue! Freedom has no advocate to spare. He is resting now, and will soon be strong—enjoying idleness, refraining from all intellectual labour, and recruiting so fast. He only reads and writes about ten letters a day, laying his hand every few moments, while absorbed at his desk, upon the top of his head, creeping, with his unsteady gait, his hand upon a table or back of a chair, or on the small of his own back, to lie down upon the sofa; and when he feels rested, back to his desk again. But he says these are letters which require no intellectual effort. He must write to his friends in Washington to stand fast by their position on the Army bill. Oh! if he only had a seat in the House now! Everything depends upon the House. He must read *The Tribune* and quite a number of other papers, then the despatches from Kansas. The Free State settlers, he fears, will be exterminated, and he watches every conflicting account with about that degree of interest which a man out on a plank at sea would feel for a sail in sight. He appears to forget that the civilization of the world, that God and humanity have sent him up to the Alleghany Mountains to take care of Charles Sumner's head; that the ardour with which he throws himself into a political conversation with any visitor is in great part born of a diseased action of the brain, and that by it the words for which the world is waiting have been expended on three drunken men. One of the scars upon his head has still a red, angry appearance, and if his face was turned up at the time of the assault his intended murderer must have been very much above him, for the scars are on the back part of the top of his head; and this red wound must have been inflicted while his head lay with the face downward. It must have required a very forcible blow to open the scalp through the masses of coarse, strong hair with which his head is crowned. "That head so comely and so wise," in every lineament of which the "white soul" speaks so eloquently. One does not easily consent to see it so, that it should be beaten with a bludgeon; but it was one who had "done no violence," and in whose mouth there was no deceit, who was "stricken, smitten for the iniquities of us all;" and if the Son of God was not too precious to be delivered up to the utmost

this. And so their fraternization with slaveholders goes on. Man-stealers are invited to their communion-tables and pulpits. Man-stealers are recognised by them, as worthy brethren, and are honoured by them as the chosen ambassadors of the Lord. To the highest of all crimes, that which violates the sanctity of manhood, they give the strongest of all sanctions, that which embraces the criminal in the arms of Christian fraternity. So long as they do this—whatever pretensions they may put forth of being "as much opposed to slavery as anybody"—their *practical* testimony is, that it is right.

It is for this, among other reasons, that we favour what some of our Western brethren call "the Free Church Movement"—that is, the organization of independent churches, having no ecclesiastical connection, directly or indirectly, with slaveholders, or with those who thus practically approve of slavery.—*American Baptist.*

A PERVERTED SYMPATHY.

The most miserable creatures that we know of are those who attempt to unite a love of slavery and of liberty. Like all bermaphrodites they are mere monsters. Every day we meet men who hate Abolitionists more than they love liberty. They turn away from every step toward liberty with aversion. They are eager to believe falsehoods against anti-slavery men. They are reluctant to believe the truth. When any event occurs tending to deepen the public feeling in favour of liberty and against slavery, they refuse to aid in publishing it. They eye it askance, with sneering jealousy. But the moment that means and opportunity are afforded to discredit such movement, they become zealous and active.

We have never seen this more illustrated than in the case of the slave woman Sarah, whose substantial emancipation took place in Plymouth Church not long ago. As much as we knew of the vindictiveness of the *we-dislike-slavery-as-much-as-anybody* men, we were surprised at their conduct in this matter. There could hardly be a case to appeal more irresistibly to the human soul. Indeed there were present in church at the time many southerners, and several slaveholders. Not one of them was unmoved. They wept, and contributed liberally. Sarah behaved herself with such modest and womanly propriety, her case was so affecting, the slave of her own father, sold by him to go South, bought by a slavetrader through sympathy, who offered to sell her to herself for a hundred dollars less than he paid for her, her little daughter of four years old kept from her by her own white father, the spontaneous uprising of three thousand strangers, and their eager charity to put into her hands that golden key which should unlock the door of her prison—all these things constituted one of the strongest cases that could arise.

What has been the result? All papers and persons who had hearts worthy of men, rejoiced in the deed and spread it abroad.

But others, what did they? Scarcely a day had passed before rumours were set in motion that it was all a deception. Pro-slavery papers, in New York and elsewhere, were shocked that such a violation of the Sabbath day and of the sacredness of a church should be tolerated! The poor woman's character was grossly assailed, and she was charged with voluntary immoralities. Fabulous incidents were paraded—such as, that a diamond cross had been put into the contribution by some fair child of wealth, whose sympathies had been deceived, and it was assumed that probably the cross was a gift of love, and squandered upon a lie; whereas no cross of any kind was ever contributed, and nothing except money, with the exception of a small common breastpin, worth one dollar, given by a poor man who had nothing else to give. Sarah's story was pronounced a forgery, the whole thing was declared to be a speculation, and finally it was blazoned abroad that she was tired of liberty, and had of her own accord gone back to her master and to slavery. This last story roused up the slavetrader who had bought her of her father, and he sent the following letter to the New York *Times*, which duly appeared in that paper:

"Richmond, Wednesday, Aug. 6, 1856.

"*To the Editor of the New York Daily Times.*

"Dear Sir: I saw a correspondence in your paper, that the slave girl Sarah had returned to me, which is a base falsehood, which I wish to correct. I had nothing to do with her going to New York, nor her coming away from there. I purchased the girl through motives of sympathy, for $1,200, and agreed to emancipate her on the payment of $1,100, which amount has been paid to me, and I have executed to her emancipation papers in the usual way. I have not seen her, or had any control over her for the last two months. I understand that she is living in Washington City with a widow lady, and is learning to read and write. Yours respectfully,

"F. Scheffer."

But there is a Southern side of this story. This Mr. Scheffer, who, in this whole transaction, has laboured with a humanity worthy of all praise, and who has proved himself a man of feeling in spite of his ignominious trade, this man *was subject to such animosity* on account of his simple kindness, that he was in danger of being mobbed, and was obliged for a time to seclude himself. What is the condition of a community when its SLAVETRADERS are liable to popular violence for humanity to slaves? This was in Richmond, in the proud old State of Virginia. In a State whose wealth largely depends upon the sale of slaves, it is not deemed safe to allow slavebrokers and slavetraders to possess over-nice feelings about their cattle.

When Sarah returned from New York to Washington, for the purpose of collecting the subscriptions which had been made toward her freedom, she found multitudes who refused to pay their subscriptions. Some because she had been among the Abolitionists; and many of the clerks in Government employ refused to keep their promises, because, if known, *it would cost them their places.* On this account it became necessary to use all that had been raised for the purchase of Sarah's child, and to raise a hundred dollars more for the completion of her own purchase-money, and the child is still in bondage. In another age this story will figure in history. Such incidents as these are characteristic of the age and communities in which they happen. And men will recount this incident as an evidence of the utter corruption both of human feeling and of moral courage, wrought in a free nation by that universal corrupter—slavery. For though the SLAVES live only in the South, the spirit of slavery pervades the nation—a contempt of man in his weakness, a contempt of liberty except for the strong, and a hatred of everything that works for liberty. Slavery, like a dismal swamp, is local; but its miasma is national. It has poisoned the very Constitution, the laws, the customs, and the people themselves, of a nation which boasts of nothing so much as its love, is hereditary love of liberty for all!—*H. W. Beecher in The Independent.*

THE TRAGEDY AT ROCHESTER, Mo.

From The Western Christian Advocate.

LETTER FROM THE REV. WM. SELLERS.

We have at length obtained a full reliable account of the late difficulties in Rochester, Mo., which resulted in the tarring of the Rev. W. Sellers, and the shooting of Benjamin Holland, an aged and beloved member of our Church. The account has been delayed till this time by severe sickess of Bro. Sellers, the consequence mainly of his inhuman treatment. Following Bro. Seller's letter will be found a communication on the same subject from another source. As will be seen, the writer is not a member of our Church, or of any Church; this will explain some rather strong expressions contained in his letter.

Bro. Conklin: At your solicitation I herein transmit to you, for the benefit of your readers, a plain statement of facts connected with the recent mob in Rochester, as they came under my own observation.

I had appointed Saturday, June 14, to commence a series of meetings in Rochester, and had written to several ministers to come and assist me. On Wednesday or Thursday previous, a Pro-Slavery man by the name of Sims was shot by a Free Soil man (one Hardesty) because Sims attempted to drive him from his home or kill him. I arrived in Rochester on Thursday, about 12 o'clock. Soon after my arrival I was waited upon in Bro. Strock's store, by a committee of three individuals, who said they were authorized by the citizens of Rochester and vicinity, to inform me not to preach again in Rochester, and endeavoured by threatening to extort a promise from me to that effect; declaring at the same time that this North Methodist preaching would not be tolerated longer in the County. I asked them for a few names of the citizens who had given them this authority; they had no names to give. I have better friends in Rochester. I then asked them if they claimed to be American citizens. They said I was a fool, and had better promise not to preach again in Rochester. I told them I would not make that promise; that I was gullty of no crime, had violated no law, and would obey God rather than men. I asked them what rights or privileges they claimed as American citizens by virtue of their citizenship, that were superior to other American citizens. At this remark, without giving me an answer, they left the store, muttering that force would be used in order to stop me.

I had some pastoral visiting to do in the country, and, after attending to that important duty, on Saturday morning I started for Rochester for the purpose of holding my meeting at the time appointed. As we rode into town we observed groups of men collected at the corners of the streets engaged in conversation. The excitement appeared to be general. I rode through the village to Bro. Strock's stable to put up my horse, and Bro. Holland, who was in company with me, went immediately into Bro. Strock's store. I came into the store in ten or fifteen minutes, and found several of my Rochester friends and some from the country, who had come to attend the meeting. Old Bro. Holland (a sainted martyr now) was standing near the front door. One of the leaders, with several others of the mob, were standing near Bro. Holland and myself, having in their hands a late number of *The Western Christian Advocate*, containing the report of the majority of the Committee on Slavery in the General Conference. I told them how that matter was adjusted, and all to no purpose; we were Abolitionists still, and I must promise not to preach, or else be mobbed. I said I would not do it. About this time the mob began to collect in front of the door. I suppose there was from seventy-five to one hundred of them—some from Platte County, some from Buchanan, some from Savannah, and others from the vicinity of Rochester. Some were armed with revolvers others had knives and clubs, while others had picked up stones in the streets. One fellow cried out, "if he had me out of the store he would soon kill me." At that remark one fellow got me by the arm, and drew me to the door. Three others then came to his assistance, and seizing hold of each arm and leg, they carried me to the middle of the street, where they halted—raving, cursing, and yelling like a body of savages who had rescued a prisoner.

While this was transpiring, Bro. Holland was shot, the ball striking him on the chin, passing through and breaking his neck. He expired in about thirty minutes. I afterwards understood that Bro. Strock was shot also, the ball cutting all his clothing and grazing the skin on his side. They also shot at Bro. Beattie and hissed him; and he then knocked two or three of them down, and escaped at the back door. These noble brethren stood with me in the battle till they were driven from their posts.

While in the street the mob held a consultation over me, as to the nature of the punishment I should receive from them, as the embodiment of civil power, and the self-constituted guardians of society, for thus attempting to preach Jesus and the resurrection under the banner of freedom. Some said, "Cut his —— throat"; others, "Scalp him"; others, "Shoot him in the head." At last they concluded to tar me. They then carried me across the street, between another store and warehouse, to a tar barrel which was sunk in the ground, and throwing me down on my back with considerable violence, held me there while they consulted as to the manner in which the tar should be applied. Some said, "Put him in head foremost"; others were for stripping me. One fellow swore they could not agree, and he would shoot me. He aimed a revolver at my head, but another wrested it from him, exclaiming, "Don't shoot him, we will give him what we think he deserves." At last they concluded to do the work without stripping me. After searching me to see whether I was armed or not, and finding I had no arms concealed about my person, they commenced putting on the tar with a broad paddle. After completely saturating my hair, they gave my eyes, ears, face and neck each a plastering. I had on a black coat, satin vest, and black cloth pants. They tarred my cravat, my shirt bosom, and my clothes, down to my feet. They then let me up.

I was so sore I could scarcely stand on my feet, but oh! the agony of my eyes. They appeared like balls of fire, and I thought they would burst out of my head. Although it was noon, and the hot sun was beaming upon my head, I groped my way as at midnight. After I arose to my feet, one fellow said, "He has one minute to leave town"; another said, "He can have five minutes, and if he is not gone in that time he shall be shot." I groped my way into the street, they followed me with their revolvers cocked, telling me to step faster at the peril of my life. I was in so much misery, I knew not where I was going. I could see objects but could not distinguish one from another. By the time I got across the street, between Bro. Strock's store and stable, the tar had melted some, and I could distinguish between males and females. Here were the female members of my flock in Rochester, over whom I felt the "Holy Ghost had made me an overseer," some of whom had ventured out in the midst of this mob to rescue their pastor from their bloody clutches. Some had fainted, others were crying and wringing their hands in excessive grief. I thought of the patriotic women of the Revolution, and that their daughters, still lived to lend a helping hand in behalf of suffering humanity. I found my horse in the yard with the bridle on, and with the assistance of one of the mob, I got the saddle on, and started to go to some place on my work as quickly as possible to get the tar washed out of my eyes. The mob followed me, however, turned me back, and made me go towards Savannah. As I passed out of town, I providentially met Bro. Chamberlin and his wife who were coming to my meeting. (I hope he will write and tell you how they served him.) When I came up to them they did not know me. After I told what had been done, Bro. C. asked me if I thought I could stand it to go to his father-in-law's, a distance of twelve miles. I told him I thought I could not endure such a trip, but was willing to try it. We rode as fast as we could, not knowing the mob was in pursuit of us. When we turned off from the main Savannah road to go to Bro. Miller's, they were not more than fifteen minutes behind us. After riding so far in the hot sun, in my condition, I was nearly dead when we arrived, but through the attention of Bro. Chamberlin and my kind friends at Bro. Miller's, in a few days I partially recovered from the injuries received. May they receive a thousand fold in this life, and in the world to come life everlasting.

These, Bro. Conklin, are facts, for which I hold myself accountable, and for which I expect to answer at the bar of God. May God take care of the scattered flock, and finally bring us all to Heaven. Wm. Sellers.

Anamosa, Iowa, Aug. 1.

VIRGINIAN INTOLERANCE.

AN INTERESTING LETTER FROM JOHN C. UNDERWOOD THE VIRGINIAN REFUGEE.

From The Buffalo Republic, August 28.

Astor House, N. Y., Aug. 14, 1856.

T. S. Sizer, Esq.—*Dear Sir:* * * * I had been staying at the Astor with my wife and boy so long that I began to fear my credit was suffering, and supposed I owed nearly a hundrnd dollars, when I went to the office to settle my bill, but I found there was no charge against me. I appealed to Mr. Stetson, the proprietor, who positively refused to accept any compensation for the trouble and expense I had caused him. He said he might himself be placed in my circumsrances, and require the aid of strangers. I hope the friends of freedom will remember the great-hearted proprietor of the Astor when they come to the city of New York.

My expulsion from home was most unexpected. I knew there was intense feeling in favour of extending slavery, and the hope of a large increase in the price of slaves resulting from the extension of the slave market. Gov. Wise had just inflamed this avarice by saying, substantially, in his ratification speech at Richmond, "elect Buchanan and spread slavery over the Western Territories, and you will increase the price of slaves from $1,000 to from $3,000 to $5,000." But I had no idea of the madness which the Governor's extravagant declaration had produced. Besides, we had, not long ago, a transaction which I had supposed had produced some calmness, reflection, and even moderation on the part of our pro-slavery men.

The case I refer to was this. One of the most worthy men of which any country can boast, Samuel M. Janney, a Quaker minister, residing near me in Loudoun County, Va., had been indicted for what was deemed a seditious publication in one of our newspapers. But it was found, on examination, that the words complained of were almost literal quotations of Jefferson and John Wesley, and the Commonwealth's attorney became very willing and anxious to enter a *nolle prosequi* and let the Quaker go. Having this case before me, I confined myself, in my Philadelphia Convention remarks, to quotations from Jefferson, and I studiously avoided even his harsher expressions. You know, he says, "If the slaves should rise in arms against us, the Almighty has no attribute which could take sides with us in the contest." I certainly said nothing that could compare with this.

I have just received a letter from a poor neighbour asking when I will return, and promising an armed and mounted escort of at least fifty of my neighbours, from the railroad dépôt to my farm, a distance of ten miles. I can hardly resist the strong inclination I feel to go home. But I have thus far yielded to the advice of friends, and the unqualified remoustrance of my wife, who believes it would be rushing upon certain destruction. She points to our little children, and claims her right to my aid in their care and education, and that appeal is irresistible.

I have written a geat many letters home to try and ally the excitement, and my wife has, through Gen. Spinner, appealed to Gov. Smith, an old friend of her family, and the representative, in Congress, in the District where the most violent proceedings against me have been held. The General informs us that he presented the letter to Gov. Smith, who, in returning it, the General says, seemed, in common with other Virginians, to be possessed with the idea that I had forfeited my right of residence in Virginia, and that where there was no statute law to meet the case, they had a right to rely on common law. What common law is meant, I don't know; perhaps it is the "higher law," though I am rather inclined to believe it must be a lower law. * * * *

I have promised to attend a Convention at Wheeling for the nomination of a Fremont State ticket for Virginia, in September, and will try to see you on my way.

Very truly and sincerely yours,

J. C. Underwood.

Excitement in Market Street.—There has been quite an effervescence among the mercantile community of this city, for a week or two past, certain attempts, it would seem, having been made to injure the business of a leading house by means unworthy of fair and generous rivals. Doubtless the young salesmen about Market street are more to blame than their principals. As to bringing politics into business, we expressed our opinion upon that point very recently. We need hardly say that we particularly admire the manly, straight-forward character of the following.—*Philadelphia Sat. Eve. Post.*

CARD.

We have been informed by a large number of our Southern customers, that systematic and pertinacious efforts are constantly made to deprive us of a portion of our trade, by appeals to the prejudices of buyers on the score of the *unsound* political sentiments of some of the members of our firm.

We, therefore, feel it a duty we owe to ourselves, and the commercial community in which we reside, to publicly declare that we have no apologies to make for our opinions, and that we will continue, as ever, to hold and express just such sentiments as our consciences and convictions dictate, without reference to the supposed views of customers, and in *especial* contempt of that class of dealers in our city who "sell their principles with their goods."

In this connection it is but justice to a large majority of our Southern friends to state, that they thoroughly appreciate and heartily despise that cringing servility which seeks gain by insincere professions of devotion to Southern institutions, or in the less manly, though more discreet form of inuendoes as to a neighbours' sentiments.

If, after this, there are any who desire to know our views before purchasing from us, we can best reply by embodying in this note an extract from a letter written by us some months since, which will explain itself:

"The members of our firm, entertaining a wide difference of views on various topics, and as many opinions on the Slavery Question as there is members of it, are fully united on *one* point, namely, that when any one presumes to demand as a preliminary to purchasing from us, that he shall know our opinions on slavery, or any other mooted question in Religion or Politics, he shall be informed as we now tell you, that he *cannot* purchase from us for cash or upon *any* terms, until he shall have amply apologized for the insult."

Morris L. Hallowell & Co.

Philadelphia, 8th Month 23d, 1856.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, SEPT. 6, 1856.

THE FUNCTIONS OF THE CHURCH.

The *Inquirer* of this city, the organ of the Unitarian denomination, had an article, two or three weeks since, entitled "The Church and Reform," suggested by one of ours noticing the new controversy between the Unitarian and Orthodox Northern Churches for the maternity of the young giant Anti-Slavery, now that it has passed its queasy infancy and has grown up into the strength and comeliness of a healthy and vigorous youth, well able to do credit and to afford support to a declining parent. We are sorry to say that neither of these venerable matrons showed much regard for the infancy and childhood of this hero of this continent and century. In its swaddling clothes it stretched out its arms of feebleness, mighty only in the divine power which slept in their undeveloped strength, and called to them for aid. But both the one and the other turned away their faces and left it in the Wilderness to be fed on locusts and wild honey. As it grew in stature and in favour with God and Man, they have both relaxed in the sternness of their first demeanour. When it shook the continent with its tread, and made its voice heard over the ocean, and seemed likely with its breath to turn the scale in which the political future of the country trembles, both, it seemed to us, were willing to salute it as the favourite child of the Church, and, in view of its weight and works, to say to it, as Milton addressed a true hero of his time,

"Therefore, on thy firm hand Religion leans
In peace, and reckons thee her Eldest Son!"

The Inquirer, however, for the denomination it represents, disclaims all claim to be the nursing mother of Anti-Slavery. It regards the Church as the proper object of the charitable cares of this new Teacher rather than as its authentic instructress. The doctrine of *The Inquirer* seems to us somewhat novel, and it must excuse us for any injustice we may have done to the Church from the erroneous impressions under which we laboured as to its nature and objects. *The Inquirer* says, "a visible Church, which should be at the same time the *leader* of reform in thought and action is an impossibility.

An *institution*, whether it be sacred or secular, matters not, must be conservative, slow to see, hard to learn, difficult to improve." * * "It must needs have a large element of resistance to change, a jealousy of new ideas, however logically deduced from its own doctrines, and a slowness to adopt even improved methods of activity." * * "Growth and development are not its first or chief duty." * * "To administer the old, not to seek the new—to stand by the truth, not to investigate the unknown, is its chief function and use." If this be the true definition of the powers and duties of the Church, we will freely admit that the strictures of the Abolitionists upon its conduct towards the American Slaves have been most unjust. Those strictures have always been grounded, not upon any ideas we held ourselves as to abstract duty, but on those very deductions from the professions of the Church itself, of which, as we have just seen, it entertains so natural a jealousy. If slowness to see, hardness to learn, and difficulty to improve, in this direction, be the seals of the apostleship of the American Church, we certainly had no right to charge it with inconsistency or want of fidelity to its mission. Of course, we take it for granted, in accepting this definition of *The Inquirer* as an exoneration of the Unitarian branch of the Church, that among the unknown quantities which it is not its function to investigate are the absolute dogmas, "thou shalt do unto others as thou wouldst that others should do unto thee"; "thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself"; including the absurd definition of a neighbour, as a man fallen among thieves, robbed, wounded and left half dead.

The writer of the article in question expresses astonishment at the interest felt in the character of the American Church by the Abolitionists for the ten years past, and at their concern for its fidelity, and their faithfulness in rebuking its shortcomings. And he seems to think that these testimonies of theirs imply a singular confidence in their own full grown Christianity, "implicit faith, absolute morality, severe beauty of life and character and utmost devotion to the cause of his Master." But he mistakes the matter altogether. We Abolitionists have not been moved to uphft our testimonies against "the lukewarmness, treachery and inconsistency of Christian professors in general," by the interest we felt in "the character of the church," but by that we felt in *the fate of the slave.* It was none of our business, as Abolitionists, to reform the Church; but it was our first and paramount duty to do all that our hands found to do to deliver the Slave from his bondage. And it was not a matter of choice or of taste, but of necessity, to question the character of every impediment we found blocking our way. Therefore, it implied no more self-righteousness or presumption in us to protest against the American Church when we found it square across our track, than it would in an engineer to expostulate against putting a meeting-house athwart the rood-bed of his railway. It was not as theologians, or sectarians, or as schismatics that we demanded of the Church either to take her feet off the necks of the Slaves or to abjure her Christian name and character, but as practical men of business who had undertaken a certain work and were bound to do our possible to accomplish it.

The basis of the Anti-Slavery Movement is that the holding of men as "chattels personal to all intents and purposes" in most of the States, and as Real Estate in the rest, is a sin against God—a flagrant violation of the Divine Law, against which every human being should protest and which he should use all rightful means to abolish. The Church we understand to profess to be an organization, which claimed Christ as its Head, for the purpose of spreading truth and removing sin from the world. When, therefore, the Abolitionists applied to the Church for assistance in their crusade against this sin and were repulsed and rebuked by her, they were obliged to offer her this dilemma and give her the choice of its horns; either that for one man to hold another as a piece of merchandise, subject to all the incidents of property, was no violation of God's law, or, being such a violation, she refused to treat it as she did all other sins. The sum of our villanies in this regard consisted in holding the Church up to what we understood her to claim as her standard, and stating the facts as to her deviation from it. But, if the views of *The Inquirer* are just and the office of the Church is "to administer interests already understood, to publish and apply truths already acknowledged and to conserve and protect principles already completed"—it being assumed that these abstract and abstruse dogmas of the Abolitionists could not be reasonably supposed to come within any of these categories—of course, we have nothing farther to say by way of exhortation or reproof.

We rather apprehend, however, that the Church, as a body, will not admit this defence of *The Inquirer*; particularly, as it overthrows it all by the fatal admission with which it begins, that it "is not able to refute, nor disposed to rebut any of the charges which Anti-Slavery makes against the Church"! We must think that here is what the lawyers call an error in the pleadings. It is as if a prisoner at the bar should plead "*nolo contendere*" (which admits the facts but entitles him to show mitigating circumstances), should go into the defence on the merits and claim an acquittal as never having committed the crime. If its views are established as to the function of the Church, it should stand acquitted; because even the most rampant Abolitionists have ever accused it of not having been true to that scheme of duty. Our complaint against the Church is that, as a body, with only here and there occasional exceptions, she has consecrated the crime of slavery, has blest and not cursed it, has taken slaveholders to her arms as brethren in Christ and permitted them to break the bread and pour the wine of the sacrament to her and her children as the anointed of God. We charge the Church, in all its impartial divisions, with recognising as eminent Christians and godly teachers of righteousness such men as Dr. Dewey and Dr. Clapp, as Dr. Adams and President Lord, as Dr. Fuller and Dr. Sharpe, as Dr. Hedding and Dr. Andrew, as Bishop Polk and Bishop Meade, men who defend slavery as a Christian institution, or who maintain the supremacy of laws enacted by man in its behalf over the laws of God against it.

It was because we found that the moral influence of such men, and the ecclesiastical bodies that sustained them, formed the strongest obstacle we had to encounter, that we have been compelled to cry aloud and spare them not. We are happy to know that our testimony has not been fruitless, as this writer most emphatically admits. If men, in view of what the Church professes and what it has done, have come to question whether this could be indeed the Church of Christ, and even, if so, of what particular use it would be, it has not been our fault. We have no quarrel with the Church excepting as it stands between us and the Slave's deliverance. We rejoice at every indication of her leaving, or any of her members leaving, the service of Slavery for that of Freedom. And we shall certainly continue the discipline, as it is deserved, which has produced the tendency to amendment in which this writer rejoices. We are, indeed, as he virtually intimates, a kind of Missionary Society for the Conversion of the American Church to Christianity and Humanity. Our success has not been such as we could wish, but it has, perhaps, been more than we had a right to expect, considering the nature of the field. But it has been enough to encourage us to go on, God helping us (which He will be sure to do), with our arduous and painful labours.

KANSAS.

The latest news from Kansas is that Gov. Shannon has issued a proclamation declaring the Territory in a state of insurrection, and calling upon all law-abiding citizens to aid the authorities in preserving the peace and protecting the rights of the people. Gen. Lane, it is said, has three parties stationed at different points in Iowa to aid him in his movements in Kansas, or facilitate his escape if he shall be compelled to fly. But this may be merely one of the lies of the telegraph. Against him and his coadjutors from the free States, this proclamation of Shannon is undoubtedly aimed, and the purpose is to bring about another invasion from the border Counties of Missouri, to drive out or murder this new party of Free State men who have made their way in by way of Iowa. The number of these persons has been much exaggerated as they amount to but a few hundred, and these have been divided into several parties to make settlements in several places. But many or few, they are undoubtedly to be dealt with as so many have been before them, that the Territory may be rid of all who are not ready to make it a slave State.

What Kansas has to hope from the Federal Government is evident from a report made a day or two ago by a subcommittee to the National Committee. It is of so much interest that we subjoin it entire. It would have been well if the Committee had sought this interview with the President a little sooner. It might have had an influence on the vote on the Army bill, and have excited the Proviso men to such vigilance that they would not have been so easily out-generalled.

To the National Kansas Committee.

The undersigned, in obedience to your instruction, waited on President Pierce on the 30th ult., and prayed his interposition against the Slave-Oligarchic invasion of Kansas. The following is a summary of results:

VIEWS OF THE PRESIDENT.

The opinions expressed by the Executive are substantially as follows:

"While Government has been exhausting its constitutional powers (which are limited) to maintain order, Kansas Aid Societies have been actively stirring up rebellion. A factious spirit among the people of Kansas respecting institutions which they need not have concerned themselves about, and which would have all come right in time, originated the troubles. From the nature, habits and education of the border men, it was natural to find them excited by such an agitation. At this crisis, the North, instead of sending in armed men, who went about boasting of their ability to protect themselves, should have sent in order-loving and law-abiding citizens; should have sent in peace-seeking men, who would have promoted concord by moral agencies—by Bibles rather than by Sharpe's rifles. Such a course would have strengthened the hands of the President, instead of tying them, as they had been. The sufferings of the settlers are, therefore, of their own seeking, and the legitimate fruits of that gunpowder-bible preaching which they and their supporters at the North have advocated. Each side is, doubtless, to blame. Inflammatory appeals are circulated both South and North, and reports, false or exaggerated, put forth by heated partizans to stir up sectional strife. If each party would only get rid of about a hundred of their designing and restless leaders, agitation would cease, and a speedy end be put to the disorders.

The interposition of the Executive is claimed by both sides, each party urging against the other exactly the same charges. At this distance from the scene of strife, the President cannot determine between them. His action must be guided by official reports. Gen. Smith communicates a very different condition of things from the exaggerated statements which have gone abroad. No apprehension of an armed invasion need be apprehended. But, should it happen, the whole power of the Government will be exerted to repel it, *come from whatever source it may.* The army in Kansas is not there to prevent or correct outrages unless they amount to invasion or insurrection. The civil power alone is competent to this. Application should be made there. Gen. Smith had no power to redress the wrongs of Mr. Strawn. He applied to the wrong quarter. He should have gone to the Courts. As to granting him an escort, "Gen. Smith thought if Mr. Strawn was smart enough to find his way safely to him without one, he ought to be able to find his way back!" The Courts are open to all classes of citizens, without distinction. No *authentic* information has ever reached the Executive of an individual who has sought a redress of wrongs at the hands of the civil power in Kansas, and failed to obtain it. If one such case had been presented, he would at once have removed the offending official. If the majority of the people in Kansas had wanted peace and quiet they could have had it. The way to get it was for the settlers among themselves to frown down all agitation growing out of differences of opinion as to local institutions. The Executive had always felt solicitous about the Territory, and had exerted his constitutional powers to their full extent to preserve order. The affair at Lawrence had given him great anxiety, and he at that time telegraphed both to Col. Sumner and Gov. Shannon, besides sending a special messenger. (Here the President produced copies of his telegraphic despatches, which, we believe, were made public at the time.) The outrages at Lawrence were not done by authority. The President admits that mistakes have been made, as is evident by his removal of Shannon. But an impartial man has now gone there, who will see justice done to both parties. If he should catch either party in acts of violence, they shall be hung up on the spot. The Civil Power of the Territory must be Maintained!"

OPINIONS OF THE PRESIDENT.

1. That Government has not the power to protect emigrants *en route* for the Territory, because of the jurisdiction of the States; consequently, outrages committed on the highways of the Nation can only be redressed by the Courts of the respective States on whose soil such outrages were committed.

2. That Government has no power to prevent or redress outrages committed within the Territory, except through the civil arm, or by martial law.

3. That the military can only aid the civil power as a *posse comitatus*; consequently,

4. Government having provided a *legal* mode of redress for the settlers, and strengthened it by a posse at all times available, the fault is with the settlers where they have failed to get protection or redress; they have failed to get it either because they were not law-abiding citizens or because they made application to the military, which was the wrong source from whence to seek it.

5. That the mere possession of arms by emigrants entering the Territory is not *prima facie* evidence of threatened invasion, and that the mere possession of arms by settlers within the Territory is not *prima facie* evidence of threatened insurrection; that the bearing of arms is a CONSTITUTIONAL PRIVILEGE which distinguishes American citizens; and then *even Government itself* HAS NO RIGHT, under such circumstances, TO DISARM THEM.

REPLY OF THE COMMITTEE.

Mr. President: During the eighteen months or more that executive power has been exerted, as it is alleged, to preserve peace in Kansas, and vainly exerted it would seem from admissions here made, the disorders of that Territory have grown only worse. At this moment they are more threatening than ever; a peaceful solution of the troubles seems still more uncertain than at any period of its former history. The President affirms that he has exhausted all his constitutional powers. And yet order is not restored. Under such circumstances may it not be worth while to inquire *whether the germ of the evils is not to be found in the Territorial laws themselves?*

President—This question I do not propose to discuss at the present time.

Committee—From whatever source, then, Sir, the difficulties in Kansas have originated, this one thing is patent to the country and to the world, that notwithstanding all the efforts of the Government, disorders of the most frightful character have prevailed; disorders that would shame the worst despotisms of the worst ages; disorders so wide-spread and so atrocious, so bloody and so infernal, so deeply damning and inhuman, that to escape them, the wretched inhabitants would make a gain if transferred to the despotic Governments of Russia, of Austria, or of France. During this dark reign of blood and terror, during this fearful tempest of violence and anarchy, these poor unshielded victims of plotted vengeance have broken no law and committed no crime. For basing slavery, because they loved Liberty, all these things have come upon them.

Such, sir, is the nature and character of the events which have transpired in Kansas during the past eighteen months' policy of the Government. As representatives of the National Kansas Committee, we are here to-day to ask *whether any change in this policy of the Administration is to be expected?*"

President—"*No, Sirs!* There will be none!"

Such, gentlemen of the National Kansas Committee, is the substance of our interview with President Pierce. The duty of commenting on the facts here stated we leave to you. Our mission is ended.

Respectfully, &c.,

Thaddeus Hyatt,
W. F. M. Arny.
Edward Daniels,
Sub-Committee of National Kansas Committee.

New York, Sept. 1, 1856.

CONGRESS.

The object of Mr. Pierce in calling the extra Session of Congress was gained on Saturday last by the passage of the Army bill without the proviso: That no part of the military force of the United States, for the support of which appropriations are made by the act, shall be employed in aid of the enforcement of any enactment heretofore passed in the bodies claiming to be the Territorial Legislature of Kansas. The bill has been banded backward and forward between the House and Senate every day for a week or two past, this amending the bill by striking out the proviso, and that returning it to the Senate with the proviso still attached. That the Senate would ever recede from its amendment was not to be expected; and that the House would ultimately yield has been feared from the beginning. It is the old story over again. A little knavery or a little carelessness is all that is needed, and whether it is by design or accident, either one or the other always comes at the right moment. If it had not so happened on this occasion it would have been the first time that the South had failed in Congress to carry anything that was of vital importance to her welfare. Had she been defeated this time, however, the loss would have been one rather of moral than of practical importance. Had Mr. Pierce really desired to use the military power in Kansas because Southern interests required it, he would not have been prevented from doing so merely because Congress virtually forbade it. But to have permitted Congress to assume the right of limiting the absolute domination of the South would have been an acknowledgment of the weakness of the master and of the strength of the servant which would never answer. In the debates in the Senate it was conceded, by Southern Senators, that many of the laws of the Shawnee Mission Legislature were unjust, oppressive and unconstitutional, but the majority were none the more, on that account, disposed to render those laws nugatory. An outside pressure also was brought to bear upon the question, by dismissing from service all the workmen employed in the Springfield and Watertown (Mass.) Armories, while the bill was pending, that it might be seen that the obstinacy of the House would only bring distress and poverty upon a large body of Northern artisans. What secret influence may have been exercised upon members nobody, of course, but those members and the Administration, knows. We see only the result, and the feeling of certainty that it would be just what it was, was in proportion to the importance attached to the measure. The majority in its favour was only four. We subjoin the yeas and nays:

YEAS—Messrs. Aiken, Akers, Barksdale, Bell, Bennett, of Missouri, Bocock, Bowie, Boyce, Branch, Burnet, Cadwallader, Campbell, of Ky., Carlile, Caskie, Clingman, Cobb, of Ga., Cobb, of Ala., Cox, Craige, Crawford, Cullen, Davidson, Davis, of Md., Denver, Downell, Edmundson, Elliott, Etheridge, Eustis, Evans, Faulkner, Florence, Fuller, of Me., Goode, Greenwood, Hall, of Iowa, Harris, of Md., Harris, of Ala., Harris, of Ill., Harrison, Haven, Hickman, Hoffman, Houston, Jewett, Jones, of Tenn., Jones, of Pa., Keitt, Kelly, Kennet, Kidwell, Lamar, Letcher, Lumpkin, A. K. Marshall, of Ky., H. Marshall, of Ky., Marshall, of Ill., Maxwell, McMullen, McQueen, Miller, of Ind., Millson, Oliver, of Mo., Orr, Packer, Peck, Phelps, Porter, Powell, Puryear, Quitman, Ricaud, Rivers, Ruffin, Rust, Sandidge, Savage, Seward, Shorter, Smith, of Tenn., Smith, of Va., Smith, of Ala., Sneed, Stephens, Stewart, Swope, Talbott, Taylor, Tyson, Underwood, Vail, Walker, Warner, Wells, Wheeler, Whitney, Williams, Winslow, Wright, of Miss., Wright, of Tenn., and Zollicoffer.

NAYS—Messrs. Albright, Allison, Barbour, Barclay, Bennett, of N. Y., Benson, Billinghurst, Bingham, Bliss, Bradshaw, Brenton, Buffinton, Campbell, of Pa., Campbell, of Ohio, Chaffee, Clarke, Clawson, Colfax, Comins, Covode, Craige Cumback, Damrell, Davis, of Mass., Dean, De Witt, Dick, Dickson, Dodd, Dunn, Durfee, Ellie, Edwards, Emrie, Flagler, Galloway, Giddings, Gilbert, Granger, Grow, Harlan, Halloway, Horton, Howard, Hughston, Kelsey, King, Knapp, Knight, Knowlton, Knox, Kunkel, Leiter, Mace, Matteson, McCarty, Morgan, Morrill, Mott, Murray, Norton, Oliver, of N. Y., Parker, Pelton, Pennington, Petitt, Pike, Pringle, Purviance, Ritchie, Roberts, Robbins, Robison, Sabin, Sage, Sapp, Scott, Sherman, Simmons, Spinner, Stanton, Straughan, Tappan, Thorington, Thurston, Todd, Trafton, Wade, Wakeman, Walbridge, Waldron, Washburne, of Ill., Washburne, of Wis., Washburn, of Me., Welch, Woodruff, and Woodworth.

Of these 101 yeas (for striking out the proviso) 80 were from the slave States; 21 from the free States. The 97 nays were all from the free States.

Though this result is unexpected to nobody—we are so like the old woman's eels—it is interesting to see precisely how it was done. The correspondent of the *Evening Post* says:

"The Extra Session of ten days is over, and the Army bill for the subjugation of Kansas, yesterday passed the House by a vote of 101 to 97. This result was expected the evening before, in consequence of the arrival of democratic absentees, but it was not anticipated that the majority would be so large against the Republicans. Their defeat on a fair face-to-face encounter with the superior numbers of their opponents, was inevitable yesterday, but it is mortifying to reflect that it actually was hastened by the derelection of men on whom they had a right to depend. They were beaten by four majority, and yet there were four of their men absent without pair from the final vote. Milward, of Pennsylvania, had gone home without pair in the morning, intending to return on Monday. Killian Miller, of New York, was away, paired with English, of Indiana, whom he supposed in Washington, but who, in fact, had been absent all the session, and could not have attended, pair or no pair. It is stated that Miller was sick, but it would have been easy to have matched him with a healthy voting democrat who desired to depart. Burlingame, of Massachusetts, lost his vote, his pair with Hall, of Iowa, proved a flash in the pan. Welsh, of Connecticut, who is said to have been in his seat ten minutes before the final vote, was in the library at the critical moment, thus showing the utility of completing one's studies before business hours. Had these representatives been in their places, with the casting vote of the Speaker, the Republicans would have triumphed."

HOW MR. CLAY SNUBBED MR. CHOATE.

Perhaps it is not quite just to assume it to be a law of nature that a politician is either a rogue or a coward, or

widow of the late Mr. R., and which, under ordinary circumstances we might venture to bring within conventional rules. Such a liberty, however, we do not feel it right to take with Mrs. Tamar Davis, who, no doubt, has her reasons for any little mannerism in which she chooses to indulge.

Mr Editor The National Anti-Slavery Standard under date of August 16, contains a notice of me so very erroneous that I must ask you to rectify it It speaks of me as being a resident of Greenwich N, J, which I am not It says that I have "written a book to prove slavery a pleasant and lovely kind of life" which I never did I challenge the world to produce such a book It says that I opposed the Temperance movement, which I did not The Maine Law and the true cause of temperance being no more synonymous, than Free-Soilism and Emancipation It refers to me as a wife and mother I hope that I discharge the duties of these relations in a manner satisfactory to my husband, and conducive to the welfare of my children That I "boldly publish" my opinions should not be a reproach with those, who contend for the largest liberty in that respect, or is freedom of speech and opinion to be tolerated only on the popular side

TAMAR DAVIS

LETTER FROM REV. SAMUEL J. MAY.

SYRACUSE, August 20, 1856.

To the Editors of The National Anti-Slavery Standard.

DEAR FRIENDS: I have pondered the comments made in your last two papers upon my 4th of July Oration, and upon the position of the Republican party, with which I have determined to act in the election of the next President.

You cannot suppose that the slightest change has taken place in my views of slavery, and of the end we are bound to attain—*even its entire extirpation.* That I look to this as the consummation, not only "devoutly to be wished," but energetically pursued, was plainly declared in the speech to which you have taken exception.

I differ from you and Messrs. Garrison, Phillips, Pillsbury and others, as to the propriety of doing what we honourably may to ensure the election of Col. John C. Fremont and Hon. William L. Dayton. Our difference on this point is owing, no doubt, to our disagreement in respect to the Constitution of the United States—the character of that document, and the obligations which it imposes upon those who swear to support or consent to live under it.

If I could see that the Constitution was intended by its framers, and those who ratified it, to be, and that it must needs continue to be, what the slaveholders and their accomplices have made it, and that the candidates of the Republican party, if elected, would be compelled by their oath of office to give their sanction to such outrages upon the rights of man as have been heretofore perpetuated by our General Government, I would let my right hand wither at my side before I would raise it to deposit my vote at the coming election.

But, touching the subject of slavery, the Constitution seems to have been made what it is by the management of politicians and statesmen, and the consent of the people. Surely, then, what they have made they can unmake. On this troublesome point the framers of the basis of our General Government intended that it should be obscure, indefinite; and so it is, to such a degree that our most devoted Abolitionists insist upon opposite interpretations of those articles under which slavery has taken shelter.

More than twenty years ago, I discovered, on a critical examination,* that there is nothing in the language of our Constitution that binds our Government or its constituents to the service of slaveholders. Into this base subserviency the people have been wheedled and bribed by their rulers. The Madison Papers show, it seems to me, that the Federal Convention refused to give explicitly any sanction to slavery. They would have been horrified at the proposal to fix this system of oppression in our Republic forever, and to put the reins of our Government into the hands of a few domestic tyrants. If anything to this effect had been apparent in their doings or intentions, the people of two-thirds of the States never would have ratified the Constitution. I need not quote, to such as yourselves, the proofs on which these suppositions rest. You are as familiar as I am with the Madison Papers, and with the Reports of the State Conventions.

Evidently, it seems to me, the intention of the framers of our Constitution was, not to give to slavery their explicit sanction or even recognition, but so to leave this difficult matter that the several States, if they chose, might maintain their "Peculiar Institution" awhile longer, on their own responsibility; and that, whenever they should see fit to abolish it (as it was confidently believed they soon would), slavery might pass away from our midst, without making any fracture in the framework of our Republic or leaving anything superfluous in it.

Time has shown that they committed a capital error. They appreciated too highly the love of liberty amongst the people. They were not aware how deeply the roots of slavery had struck into our land. They did not foresee how great would be the inducements of a portion of these States to protect and foster this evil. They never dreamt that the Constitution they had devised, "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity"—they never dreamt that the instrument they had so carefully formed was to be so wielded by a slaveholding oligarchy that it would produce precisely the opposite effects—disunion, injustice, civil war—in order to perpetuate and extend a system of more cruel oppression than ever before afflicted any portion of the human race. Yet all this has come to pass.

Since the generation to which the founders of our Republic belonged passed away, the statesmen of the South have claimed, and the statesmen of the North have conceded, that a momentous compact was made in and by our Constitution guaranteeing the enslavement of a large body of the inhabitants of the land. In the national conventions of the political parties this grand assumption has passed without question. The people generally throughout the country have been instructed to believe that a provision for the protection of slavery is an integral part of our civil fabric. Our Presidential elections have been so managed that the administration of the General Government has been kept in the hands of slaveholders or their creatures, excepting only for eight years. And the United States Court, the authorized expounder of the fundamental law of the land, and which, of late, has shown itself to be the supple tool of "the Powers that be," has always put pro-slavery interpretations upon the Constitution, and given the weight of its influence to our oppressors.

But, surely, if we examine the Constitution itself, we shall find therein nothing to prevent our nation's receding from all the wrong into which we have been misled, and making our General Government to conform to the glorious intention, declared by its framers, in the preamble of the Constitution.

We might plead that the repeated, egregious violations of the Constitution by the slaveholders, and in their behalf—the annexations of Louisiana, Florida and Texas; the utter denial to citizens of the free States of the right of ingress into the slave States; the assaults, violent, murderous assaults, made by slaveholders upon liberty of speech and freedom of the press—we might plead that their violations of the Constitution exonerate us from our obligations under that compact; but we do not claim any right to set at naught our part of the agreement, because they have desecrated and trampled upon theirs.

Whatever our Fathers of the Republic agreed to do or to permit, that we can do or permit without sin, we will not fail to keep the agreement, however false and treacherous to us the slaveholding portion of the Union may have been. But our interpretation of the Constitution may honestly be different from theirs; and, then, if any of its provisions do indeed require of us *to commit sin*, we are bound to treat them as null and void, because no conventional agreements can exonerate us from the law of God.

General Jackson set the example, or rather avowed the principle, that the President of the United States is bound to support the Constitution as he understands it. The Hon. Wm. H. Seward has announced and maintained in Congress the doctrine of "The Higher Law." And you and I, and all true Abolitionists and true men know full well, that no constitutions, nor compromises, nor compacts which our fathers may have made for us, or we can make for ourselves, can impose upon us any obligation to set at naught the inalienable rights of any men, or the unchangable laws of Almighty God. We are all, in virtue of our moral constitution, under higher obligations to break than to keep a wicked agreement, that we ourselves may have made; much more an agreement that others may have made for us. This doctrine I declared, as explicitly as I was able to declare it, in the first discourse I ever delivered upon slavery* — and I have preached it ever since.

Our National Legislature, it is true, have enacted pro-slavery laws; the United States Court have pronounced them constitutional; and the Executive arm has been stretched forth to enforce the observance of them. Nevertheless, no moral obligation has been imposed upon any one to treat such laws with the slightest respect. The Constitution, on which they rely for their authority, is not competent to give them any moral validity. We cannot obey them without committing sin. Never since I turned my thought to the subject have I hesitated to deny utterly the right of the slaveholder to his bondmen. The Constitution itself, if it was intended, or has been perverted to bind them to him, could have no more force (morally speaking) than a rope of sand. Every one who has the opportunity, is as much bound to aid the escape of an American slave, as of one held in durance vile by an Algerine Pirate.

In this and in all the fundamental principles of our enterprise, as laid down in "the Declaration of the Sentiments and purposes of the American Anti-slavery Society"—I heartily agree with you and with Mr. Garrison. I also think with you that the work we have had, and still have to do, mainly, is to correct the public sentiment, and prick the consciences of our countrymen on the subject of slavery; for not until they are brought to appreciate the enormous wickedness of holding fellow-men in bondage, and realize their responsibility, indirectly as well as directly, for the continuance of slavery, will they desire to be exonerated from the guilt of such oppression. We have toiled diligently for twenty-five years in this direction, and have accomplished much, though much less than we expected to do in so long a time. We should persevere, for the most part, in the same way. But I am unable to see with you the impropriety of also acting *politically* to the overthrow of slavery whenever we can do so without a compromise of principle. In our Declaration at Philadelphia, December, 1833, it is said, "We also maintain that there are, at the present time, the highest obligations resting upon the people of the free States to remove slavery by moral and *political* action, as prescribed in the Constitution of the United States." I see not why the same obligation does not press upon us now as then.

Several links of the chain that binds the American slave may be broken by the hands of our General Govern ment in virtue of the powers vested in it by the Constitution. Congress can abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, and the Executive can then cleanse our National Capitol of that most offensive of all nuisances. Congress can forbid the introduction of slavery into any of the Territories, and deny admission into the Union to any new State, but upon the condition that there shall be no slavery in it. Congress can forbid utterly the inter-State slave trade, and it will then be the duty of the Executive to enforce the prohibition on land and at sea. Moreover, Congress has power, and in virtue of the 1st clause of the 2d Sec. of the IV Art. of the Constitution is bound to make all necessary provisions, and call upon the Executive to use all the means at its command, to secure to the citizens of the free States, whatever may be their complexion, unmolested ingress into and egress out of the slave States, with the full enjoyment of all the privileges and immunities of the citizens of those States.

All these things the Congress of these United States may do, if they please; and they will please to do all these things so soon as "the People" require them at their hands. And when all these things are done, it will be no difficult matter, *by moral and ecclesiastical instrumentalities*, to extirpate all the roots of slavery from the several States where they are beyond the reach of our General Government.

I am, therefore, unable to see how we Abolitionists can labour so effectually, to the great end we have in view, as by uniting with "the people" whenever they shall be brought to attempt to obtain from Congress either of the things named above. The same sentiments which will impel them to demand of their Legislature one of those acts of righteousness, shall urge them to require also each of the others; and the same reasons that will require Congress to comply with one of these demands of the public heart, shall also require them to comply with all the rest.

Ever since I became acquainted with Mr. Garrison (one of the most pregnant events of my life) I have seen clearly with him, and have united with him in declaring "immediate emancipation to be the right of the enslaved, and the duty of the enslavers." But I have not expected to bring the majority of the people to this great truth *all at once*, and to act accordingly. I have expected that the progress of this truth would be by steps, and much slower than our wishes. But every step in the right direction brings us nearer to the end, and increases our confidence that we shall reach the end.

Seldom, since the commencement of the Anti-slavery enterprise, has either ot the political parties presented to us any inducement to cooperate with it. Generally both Whigs and Democrats have repulsed us from them, in disgust at their heartless indifference to the claims of the bondmen, or their cold-blooded concessions to the demands of the oppressors. It has been apparent that neither the one nor the other party has aimed to overthrow slavery, or even to prevent its extension. Seldom, therefore, throughout the last tweuty-five years, have I voted, or given any countenance to either political party. But now, under the retributive providence of God, the people of the Northern States are themselves suffering from the encroachments of the slaveholders. They find their own liberties restricted, and in danger of being yet more seriously abridged. This has roused them, as they never were roused before, to a consciousness of the destructive influence and malign spirit of slaveholders in our Republic. They have come, a great majority of them, I believe, deeply to feel the imminent peril they are in, and to resolve to confine the dominion of the slaveholders within its present limits, if nothing more. If they should really do this, and no more, this, in due time, would suffocate the tyrants. But if they do this, you and I can easily foresee, that they will be compelled to go farther in behalf of Liberty, or else recede from even this small advance. However, we need not now foreshow all that we foresee.

The Republican party is fired with the determination to arrest the progress of slavery—to prevent its extension. This is all they profess now to intend doing. But they do not declare that they will do no more. They have put up no barriers to their future inroads upon the great usurpation. And if they do stop after this, once more they will be overridden and left behind by another higher political wave which will assuredly follow this. What they propose to do, the best friends of freedom must desire to have done. They are moving in a right direction, i. e., against Slavery. They have taken issue with the Slaveholders' party on a vital point. I wish them success. I shall, therefore, as now advised, go with them to the polls.

Mr. Fremont, in his acceptance of the nomination of the Republican party, has very explicitly declared his antagonism to slavery; and he possesses the qualities that will make that antagonism felt, wherever he may come in conflict with the Power that is attempting to extend this fell dominion. Tis true, he has avowed his determination to defer to the authority of the several States, touching the slavery within their borders. This is no more than the American Anti-Slavery Society did at its formation. And if Mr. Fremont and Mr. Dayton will encourage and sanction all the enactments against slavery, which Congress might constitutionally pass, we shall all concur in pronouncing upon them the commendation—"well done, good and faithful servants." This commendation will they deserve, although they leave us at the end of their career, still to toil for the liberation of the enslaved in the several States, by moral and ecclesiastical means alone.

There are no persons living, whose approval of my sentiments and actions I desire more than Mr. Garrison's and yours. But I must nevertheless follow my own convictions; and also give due heed to my instincts and intuitions. These all are impelling me to labour for the election of Messrs. Fremont and Dayton. If, however, you, or any one, can show me before the day of voting, that I shall do any moral wrong in giviug my vote for those gentlemen, it will not be too late, at the last moment, to withhold it. And if the effect of their election shall not be what I predict it will be, I shall then as frankly confess that I was mistaken, as I now avow my conviction that it will promote the redemption of the enslaved, to vote with the Republican party.

I am deeply persuaded *the crisis has come.* The friends of Liberty and the friends of Slavery are to have a conflict. It will undoubtedly be a violent, perhaps a most bloody conflict. If Messrs. Fremont and Dayton are elected, the friends of Liberty will have the vantage ground. But if Messrs. Buchanan and Breckenridge are elevated to the Presidencies, the Army and Navy, with the United States Treasury, will be at the disposal of the Slaveholding oligarchy; and the hosts of office holders, and expectants of office, will be everywhere, the land over ready and eager to do their bidding. We can then have nothing to expect but "the tender mercies of the cruel." Yours truly, SAMUEL J. MAY.

*See Anti-Slavery Magazine, Vol. 2.

†See my 4th of July Oration, 1831, published by Garrison & Knapp.

OBITUARY.

Lines written on hearing announced the death of MRS. CHARLES L. REMOND, *Salem, Mass.*

HAST thou indeed departed, friend,
To other scenes of bliss,
To seek that perfect happiness
Thou could'st not find in this.

Beloved, to fond idolatry,
Wert thou within thy sphere,
Ah! who can fill thy vacant place
Made desolate and drear?

Let roses strew the path that winds
Unto thy silent tomb,
Their fragrance fill the sacred air,
Their flowers ever bloom.

True symbol of thy perfect self,
They bud, they bloom, they die.
They live on earth again, but thou
With God, in Heaven, on high.

The Gods strike those they love, they say,
Death loves a shining mark,
Why wonder, then, that it so soon
Transfixed thy loving heart. J. C.

Philadelphia, Aug. 25, 1856.

Our Philadelphia Correspondence.

PHILADELPHIA, August 30th, 1856.

MESSRS. EDITORS: *Politics*, like "misery makes strange bedfellows." The *Pennsylvanian*, is recommending to the Democracy of our city the propriety of exhibiting a high degree of benevolence in behalf of such official paupers as have consented to support James Buchanan, although they profess to be "Old line Whigs." It will not be the first time that Josiah Randall has been "hand and glove" with John W. Young and John Cadwallader, nor will he and William B. Reed together, with some more of the same proclivity towards the spoils of office, be in anywise abashed to find themselves snugly folded up in the mantle of modern Democracy. But just think of the *Pennsylvanian*, after having read Judge Kelley (who, I suppose, you are apprised, has been nominated for Congress by the Republicans of the fourth Congressional district) out of the party for deciding that William B. Reed was entitled to the office of District Attorney after the partizans of that paper and its myrmidons of the "Fourth Ward Moyamensing" had stuffed the ballot-box with four hundred spurious tickets, cast in the names of electors gathered from the tomb stones or passenger lists of the emigrant ships, for the purpose of defeating him—think, I say, of the *Pennsylvanian* foreshadowing his nomination for the same office, or some other, by the Democracy. The "Old line Whigs," hunker and pro-slavery as many of them always have been, will perhaps have found their proper position among their old enemies with whom they warred about United States Bank, Tariff, &c.' in the days of Jackson and Clay. If man, as is asserted, undergoes a physical change to the extent of an entire re-production of the animal machine in some seven years, politicians may certainly be excused for exhibiting changes as great and much more apparent in double that number of years.

The Democracy, however, have not secured all the fosil remains of the devotees of Clay and Webster, for I perceive that the Hon. James Cooper, ex-United States Senator and Advocate for the State of Maryland, versus Castner Hanway, is in nomination by the Know-Nothings of this city for our State Legislature. They are heartily welcome to all the advantages they can realize thereby. Many of our Anti-Slavery friends appear to be apprehensive that the interests of the *Slave* may be lost in the Presidential contest now in progress, and such seems to be the view which THE STANDARD takes of the foray.

Permit me to remind you of the old adage, "When rogues fall out, honest men may get their due." The disruption of the *old* political organizations was great gain to the cause; the *new* continually being forced into support or antagonism of slavery. True, many make but a small step in advance and will probably turn back, in imitation of John Van Buren and other kindred spirits; but while they do profess some form of opposition to our National Cause, they frequently make converts to freedom who do not turn with them when self-interest in some of its protean shapes has carried the leaders back into the Camp of the Spoilers. Consequently, I feel much gratification at beholding Fremont sustained by many who make but small pretensions to anti-slavery sentiments, but are content to use them and to associate with Abolitionists to a certain extent and under protest. Their doing so renders them marked men, never to be trusted by the South, and eventually forces them to adopt the very views against which they protested. They are made to see and feel the domineering spirit of the slavedriver, until they see no alternative but abject submission or open and uncompromising opposition to the institution in all its workings.

The strangest, and, perhaps, the most uncongenial, "bedfellows" in this political campaign are the *Tribune* and the *Herald*. That Greeley and Bennett should both be advocating the election of the same individual for the Presidency is indeed an anomaly, however different the arguments and reasons given by each for his course of procedure. Bennett asserts that he is pursuing the course he has adopted in this contest for the purpose of forever silencing abolitionism, which he holds, as it does him, in utter abhorrence. Yet, albeit, he is made of more demoniac material than "*The fools who came to scoff remained to pray*"—he may induce others to form associations which will lead them to tread in paths hereafter which he may neither desire nor be able to travel, by reason of the inherent vileness of his pro-slavery tendencies.

At all events, this political struggle has the merit of being based upon the *extension or limitation of slavery*, if nothing more. In the controversy, the institution in all its phases will be pretty freely examined and discussed. This of itself is great gain; for what we want is examination, discussion, agitation, anything in preference to the stagnation and apathy in which we were steeped some twenty-five or thirty years ago. Let slavery in any of its aspects constitute the subject of political contention, and the institution will be wounded and exposed in some of its deformities during the melée. Converts will be made to the cause of universal emancipation; and will stay made. Therefore, since you cannot participate in the fight, be not alarmed for the result. No true anti-slavery man will be lost in the contest, though some of the weak may be temporarily overcome, and, possibly, some traitors, if there be such in the camp of liberty, may go over to the enemy. For every one so lost we shall gain an hundred anxious to rid themselves and their country of the giant evil. The march s onward, and though at times the trumpet may give out an uncertain sound, inducing the belief that a retreat has commenced, be assured, that doubtful note will soon be changed or silenced, and that the wrongs of the slave will not be entirely lost sight of, though he be black, when his white brother is struggling to keep his own limbs unshackled.

The Republicans are increasing in numbers and activity in this city, and the *institution* finds no favour with most of its orators who may not improperly be denounced as Abolitionists by the Richmond *Whig* and Charleston *Mercury*, however some of them may feel inclined to "deny the soft impeachment."

Whether Buchanan be elected or defeated, good will arise from the contest. As to Fillmore, there does not appear to be any hopes for him, notwithstanding he has a strong party here who are ever ready to "crowd out" the Republicans and to produce disorder at their meetings. The *Pennsylvanian* has suddenly become very charitable to the Fillmore party, fearing no danger from its existence but considerable fear at the prospect of its dissolution. No further "exposure of the Know-Nothings" may be looked for from that quarter.

The President and his subordinates have been exhibiting some of their petty malice against Massachusetts by discharging the hands employed in the United States Armory at Springfield, on the plea of want of funds in consequence of the House not agreeing to furnish an unconditional appropriation for army purposes. Had the Armory been at Richmond or Augusta its operatives would have been safe from all fear of deprivation of employment. I could wish that the discharged workman could take his "kit of tools" to Kansas and erect an Armory there for the use of freemen, and, though not so well paid, they would be much better employed than they have been heretofore, until "freedom's battle won" they could change their occupation to the more peaceful one of making ploughs, grain-drills, reapers and threshing machines.

It is scarcely to be expected that the House will carry its point against the stand taken by the slavery organized Senate. It would be too much to expect yet. The idea of resistance to the behest of the dark power is too new to have acquired a sufficient stamina to withstand the various forms of "crushing out" so well understood by the managers at Washington. The Union must be "saved" once more, by a few doughfaces selling out to the slavery party in Congress—and their constituents will be expected to sanction the act. This thing of "saving the Union" has been the principal trading capital of a large number of venal and timid politicians for some years past; how long their arduous services may be required in that line appears to be yet undetermined, as every effort at saving their patient from dissolution seems, according to their own showing, to leave it in a more feeble and ricketty state. Their labours of patriotic love are really astonishing. Pity they are not attended with better success. J.

From our Cincinnati Correspondent.

CINCINNATI, August 28, 1856.

POLITICAL discussion is now the "order of the day" among us. Political excitement is running high and promises before the Fall elections to reach the highest point ever known. Politics form the staple of our daily papers, Portraits and Lives of the candidates are advertised by the thousand, appointments and reports of "Mass meetings," party banners and music are all around us, and the air may be said to be "tremulous with Presidential huzzas." This is particularly the case in the evenings when political meetings are in progress in the various Wards every night, those of the Buchanan and Fillmore men often attended with music, fire-works and other clap-trap devices to attract attention. And no party is so profuse in the use of this electioneering clap-trap as the Fillmore men. From the great ado they make here and the boastings of their sole organ, the *Daily Times*, a stranger to the real state of affairs would take the "American" to be the strongest party both in the City and State. And yet outside of this city, where it is kept up by a noisy clique of Know-Nothing politicians, the party has no strength and in many of the northern counties is hardly known at all.

Yesterday there was a grand "Union Meeting" called by the "Americans" on the Public wharf, to which the people of both the North and South were invited. A rope was stretched across the river to which flags were strung and, by aid of bon-fires, music and fire-works, a miscellaneous crowd of "patriots" from Kentucky, and curiosity-seekers, was collected, all of which will be heralded in the Fillmore papers as an evidence of enthusiasm in his favour. At the same time, Ohio is about to give her vote to Fremont, and Kentucky hers to Buchanan. The truth is, that the "American" party while everywhere losing ground at the North is also losing at the South, and every day the contest is narrowing down more directly between Liberty and Slavery—Fremont or Buchanan.

In this County (Hamilton) there will be three tickets in the field for Congress and County offices. Two years ago, when the State went by an overwhelming majority for the anti-Nebraska ticket, there was a cordial union of all the elements of opposition to the Administration in this County, and Tim. C. Day and J. Scott Harrison, the first Democratic, the second Whig, but both professedly anti-Nebraska, were chosen by majorities never before known here, large numbers of Democrats voting for them. The first tide of indignation against the Pierce Administration having subsided, and the lines having been drawn for a Presidential contest, the slave Democracy have rallied, and (the opposition being divided) will, no doubt, carry their County ticket, and both their candidates for Congress. In a fair contest, the regular Democracy have always had a majority in this County, though frequently defeated of late years by divisions in their own ranks or popular uprisings against some of the odious acts of their party.

At present there seems to be no prospect of an union between the Republicans and Americans. The latter are determined to nominate J. Scott Harrison for reëlection in the second district, and the Republicans are just as fixed in their determination not to vote for him, as he has acted with the "South Americans" during the late session of Congress, voting against Banks for Speaker and against the Bill admitting Kansas as a free State. The District, if a Whig one at all, is so by a small majority, and as the Democrats have a candidate, Mr. Groesbeck, of the highest ability and standing aside from his politics, they can hardly fail to elect him. Whether he or Mr. J. A. Gurley, the Republican candidate, is chosen, Mr. Harrison will have leave to stay at home.

Much has been said as to the Germans going for Fremont. It is true that many of the intelligent Germans are on the side of freedom who would not have taken such a stand had Judge McLean been the nominee, generally the "freemen" and the Protestant Germans, but the air may be said to be "tremulous with Presidential huzzas." This is particularly the case in the evenings when political meetings are in progress in the various Wards every night, those of the Buchanan and Fillmore men often attended with music, fire-works and other clap-trap devices to attract attention. And no party is so profuse in the use of this electioneering clap-trap as the Fillmore men. From the great ado they make here and the boastings of their sole organ, the *Daily Times*, a stranger to the real state of affairs would take the "American" to be the strongest party both in the City and State. And yet outside of this city, where it is kept up by a noisy clique of Know-Nothing politicians, the party has no strength and in many of the northern counties is hardly known at all.

Yesterday there was a grand "Union Meeting" called by the "Americans" on the Public wharf, to which the people of both the North and South were invited. A rope was stretched across the river to which flags were strung and, by aid of bon-fires, music and fire-works, a miscellaneous crowd of "patriots" from Kentucky, and curiosity-seekers, was collected, all of which will be heralded in the Fillmore papers as an evidence of enthusiasm in his favour. At the same time, Ohio is about to give her vote to Fremont, and Kentucky hers to Buchanan. The truth is, that the "American" party while everywhere losing ground at the North is also losing at the South, and every day the contest is narrowing down more directly between Liberty and Slavery—Fremont or Buchanan.

In this County (Hamilton) there will be three tickets in the field for Congress and County offices. Two years ago, when the State went by an overwhelming majority for the anti-Nebraska ticket, there was a cordial union of all the elements of opposition to the Administration in this County, and Tim. C. Day and J. Scott Harrison, the first Democratic, the second Whig, but both professedly anti-Nebraska, were chosen by majorities never before known here, large numbers of Democrats voting for them. The first tide of indignation against the Pierce Administration having subsided, and the lines having been drawn for a Presidential contest, the slave Democracy have rallied, and (the opposition being divided) will, no doubt, carry their County ticket, and both their candidates for Congress. In a fair contest, the regular Democracy have always had a majority in this County, though frequently defeated of late years by divisions in their own ranks or popular uprisings against some of the odious acts of their party.

At present there seems to be no prospect of an union between the Republicans and Americans. The latter are determined to nominate J. Scott Harrison for reëlection in the second district, and the Republicans are just as fixed in their determination not to vote for him, as he has acted with the "South Americans" during the late session of Congress, voting against Banks for Speaker and against the Bill admitting Kansas as a free State. The District, if a Whig one at all, is so by a small majority, and as the Democrats have a candidate, Mr. Groesbeck, of the highest ability and standing aside from his politics, they can hardly fail to elect him. Whether he or Mr. J. A. Gurley, the Republican candidate, is chosen, Mr. Harrison will have leave to stay at home.

Much has been said as to the Germans going for Fremont. It is true that many of the intelligent Germans are on the side of freedom who would not have taken such a stand had Judge McLean been the nominee, generally the "freemen" and the Protestant Germans, but the great mass, at least in this city, including all the Catholic Germans, will vote, as they have always done, with the Slave Democracy.

This part of the State of Ohio, and especially this city, where the influence of slavery and the Liquor interest is felt, will always be a hard field for the cause of freedom. It is so in all our large cities. Many of the merchants, conservative men, old Whigs, timid souls and Union-saviours will go for Fillmore, and the vote in this city will show him to be stronger here than in any other part of the State. For the rest of the State I have no fears. Mr. Fremont as a candidate is much stronger than Gov. Chase, and will carry the State by a far larger majority. The prospects of Fremont in the North-western States are every day improving. Even in this city it is easy to see that among men of all parties the old cries of Abolition and Disunion are losing their force, and men not hitherto seen on the side of freedom are with us acting and speaking with an independence almost unknown a few years since. Whatever may be the result of the coming election we feel confident that the formation of the Republican party and its nominations are Providential, and the discussion it has suggested has produced a moral agitation as powerful and important in the end as the political. At all events, the cause of freedom, allied as it is with all that is just and holy, must go forward and triumph. Political success may aid it, but political defect cannot destroy it. Yours, P.

THE *Richmond Enquirer* of the 26th ult., says:

"If Fremont be elected, there is not the slightest hope that the Union will last an hour after Mr. Pierce's term expires."

Gen. Houston, United States Senator from Texas, said the other day in the Senate:

"They tell me, if Fremont is elected, forty thousand bayonets will bristle about the Capitol—that the South, in fact, will secede. Mr. President, I scorn the suggestion! There will be neither bristling bayonets nor secession."

We are afraid Gen. Houston is right.

THE *Boston Congregationalist*, the most widely circulated "orthodox" newspaper in New England, has come out zealously in favour of the Republican ticket. The *Evangelist* of this city follows suit; so that these papers and *The Independent* give to the Republican movement the influence of the principal organs of Northern Presbyterianism. The *Observer* takes no part. We believe it thinks politics wicked.

A NEW PAPER.—Wm. A. Hunter, of Bryan Co., Ohio, has issued the first number of a new paper called *The Political Abolitionist*. It advocates Gerrit Smith's election to the Presidency, and maintains his view of the Constitution.

Summary.

The Fillmoreans of Massachusetts have nominated George W. Gordon, of Boston, for Governor, in place of Amos Lawrence, who will not run on their ticket. Mr. Gordon was once Postmaster of Boston, and is said to be very popular.

MR. SUMNER.—A writer in the Springfield *Register* strongly urges the nomination of Mr. Sumner for Governor. We also find the following editorial paragraph in that paper:

"Rufus Choate, who is good authority with the opposition, says if the Fremont men should happen to nominate Charles Sumner for Governor of Massachusetts, they would sweep the State by 30,000 majority over everything else. Well, they would! And why cannot it be done?"

A Dubuque paper says that "Thomas H. Benton—now residing at Council Bluffs, nephew of Col. Benton and cousin of 'our Jessie'—long known and recognised as one of the chief leaders of the Democratic party of Iowa, and a very great favourite of that organization, has come out from the corruption of the Pro-Slavery faction, and declares himself openly for Fremont and Freedom. He will work faithfully for Fremont's success."

The *Montgomery* (Ala.) *Advertiser* has the following with reference to Mr. Sumner, by way of comment on a letter which was published in the *Evening Post* the other day. It is copied into the *Richmond Enquirer*. Both papers support Buchanan:

"What a pity! what a pity! 'If he essays to walk, *his lower limbs refuse their office.*' Possibly they are ashamed to propel the contemptible carcass of the cowardly cur. The most satisfactory *test* to which his 'lower limbs' could be subjected would be to set Preston S. Brooks after him with a good cane."

The Wilmington (N. C.) *Journal* says: "On Friday last, a runaway negro camp was discovered on an 'island' in Big Swamp, situated between Bladen and Robeson Counties. On Saturday morning, a company of twelve or fourteen started out to hunt them, and, after starting them from their camp one of the negroes fired at Mr. David C. Lewis, wounding him, from the effects of which he died on Sunday morning. On Friday, a man named Taylor was shot at twice from the same place, but missed. The negroes had cleared a place for a garden, had cows, &c., in the swamp; none arrested. The swamp is about four miles wide, and almost impenetrable.

"DRED."—A German translation of the new novel of Harriet Beecher Stowe will be issued on the 1st of September, simultaneously with the first appearance of the work in the English language. Messrs. Gustav Rothe and Adolf Donai are the translators. It will be remembered that a German version of "Uncle Tom" was published in Philadelphia by F. W. Thomas, who was sued by Mrs. Stowe for the infringement of her copyright. The decision in that case having been adverse to the author, she has taken the proper precautions to prevent a German reprint of her new work.—*Evening Post.*

TARRED AND FEATHERED.—A gentleman from Washington, Pa., informs us that great excitement prevailed in that borough a few days since, in consequence of a negro having been tarred and feathered by the coloured inhabitants of the village. Some time ago a number of slaves escaped from Virginia; and their owners suspecting that they were concealed in the vicinity of Washington, they sent, it is alleged, the negro spoken of to ferret them out. A rumour of his mission reaching the coloured inhabitants, they rose en masse, and, assisted by several citizens, provided the alleged spy with a coat of tar and the usual accompaniment—feathers. Thus attired, he was driven out of town, and has not since been heard of.—*Pittsburg Chronicle.*

PASSENGERS PER U. G. R. R.—We [*Bugle*] find the following account in the Mahoning *Register*, of a company of Southern travellers who passed through Salem, a few days since, on a pleasure trip to the lakes:

"A hack-load of some nine sable individuals, driven by Gen. Gibbons, of Salem Station, passed through our place on Saturday last. Report says that six of the party were 'chattles'—wearied of the luxuriant living—the indolent ease and balmy skies of their Southern home, seeking a change of air and scene in a Northern clime. Instead of passing by the usual route of the U. G. R. R. they were travelling along leisurely on the Plank Road, above ground—well armed—and prepared to give a warm reception to any blood hound who might be dogging their path. QUILL-PEN."

J. B. Brant, of St. Louis, who is connected by marriage with Col. Benton's family, writes the following letter in relation to the charge made by the lone Know-Nothing organ of this city, that Col. Fremont is or has been a slave-owner:

"ST. LOUIS, Aug. 11, 1856.

"In reply to your note and slip, I have to say that Col. J. C. Fremont to my knowledge never owned a slave, nor has he had slaves in or about my house; neither has he had slaves hired out in this City, County or State. The writer for the news paper has, doubtless, mistaken Capt. Jacob, of Kentucky, for Fremont, who also married a daughter of Thomas H. Benton, and moved with his family and slaves to Boone County, Mo., and some two years since returned to Kentucky with his negroes. He usually, as did Col. Fremont, stops at my house. My wife is the daughter of Samuel Benton, deceased, of Texas, and niece of Thomas H. Benton, of Mo. So much for the veracity of the writer of the slip sent me, which is false in every part and portion, gotten up for bad purposes; hence I am induced to give it a flat contradiction, but hereafter I shall not reply to such trash, Col. Fremont being fully able to defend himself against these newspaper slanders. J. B. BRANT."

A writer in the Wellsburg (Va.) *Herald*, who is evidently a Southern non-slaveholder, speaks out in church in the following strain:

"We are taxed to support slavery. The clean cash goes out of our own pockets into the pockets of the slaveholders, and this in many ways. I will now allude to but two. If a slave, for crime, is put to death or transported, the owner is paid for him out of the public treasury, and under this law thousands are paid out every year. Again, a standing army is kept up in the city of Richmond for no other purpose than to quell insurrection among the slaves; this is paid for out of the public treasury annually. This standing army is called the public guard, but it is no less a standing army always kept up. We will quote from the acts of 1856 the expense of these two items to the State, on the 23d and 24th pages of the acts: 'To pay for slaves executed and transported, $22,000'; 'to the public guard at Richmond, $24,000.' This, he is noticed, is only for one year, making near $50,000 for two objects in one year; but it can be shown by the present unequal plan of taxation between slave property and other property, that this is but a small item of our cash pocketed by the slaveowners; and yet some will say we have no reason to complain."

THE TERRORISM OF THE PRESS IN NEW ORLEANS.—The following communication appears in a German paper, published in New Orleans, which is slightly tinged with Free Soilism:

"*To the Editors of the Deutsche Zeitung.*

"GENTLEMEN: The course which your journal has pursued within the last four months is undoubtedly calculated to bring disgrace and dishonour upon all citizens of German extraction, who, because supporting such a sheet, are denounced as Abolitionists. This state of things must have an end. I have therefore prepared some extracts from your journal, which will prove it to be a stumbling block that cannot be tolerated in this section; and these extracts I shall send to an Anglo-American paper for publication. You will readily perceive that the further existence of your journal, after such exposure, will be out of the question. Before having recourse to this extreme measure, however, I will give you timely warning. I now tender the following propositions:

"1. Hoist the Democratic flag immediately, and publish the entire Democratic ticket until after the election.

"2. Advocate publicly and purely the democratic principles.

"The result of such a course will be to unite the German voters at the coming election.

"I must, however, beg you to forward to me a formal written guaranty to accept and abide by my stipulations before 12 o'clock m., this day. If up to that hour such a guaranty is not received, I shall *act*, and you must then bear the consequences. Respectfully yours, C. F. HEUNISCH.

"Notary's office. 97 Exchange place."

UNDERGROUND RAILROAD — $16,800 WORTH OF "PROPERTY" ON THE WING!—An Express train upon the Underground Railroad, passed through our city the present week with a freight of more than usual interest. Not many days ago, nine robust, intelligent, and "right down smart" young men of Old Virginia, decided to visit our beautiful Lake, and the regions that lie beyond. As they thought they might be in something of a hurry the first night of their journey, they took along six horses belonging to the gentleman with whom they had laboured a very long time at very low wages. These horses the next morning, were turned homeward, and the riders took to the woods. In a few days "Massa," with a posse of his neighbours, overtook the travellers—when a vigorous contest ensued—the nine travellers maintaining the field, and sending their pursuing neighbours back, at an uncomfortably fast pace. The parties next approached each other in the city of Pittsburg. The nine travellers took private lodgings—so private that the pursuers lost the scent—though the old Master had offered a reward of $3,000 for the seizure of the runaway property. From Pittsburg three of the party made direct for Canada. The remaining six in due time took the cars for Salem—and were astonished to find one of their pursuers on the same train. By the management of a humane and ingenious conductor, the hound was left at some way-station, and at the first intersection the travellers took passage on the Underground road.

Monday morning, gentlemen were about our city, said to be gentlemen from Virginia, in search of six slaves. In the early train of that morning, a Mr. Lawrence, of this city, left for Ashtabula—reported to have gone in the capacity of a Deputy Marshal, in search of his travelling property. We know not that we have a man in this city mean enough to engage in such business—but at Ashtabula, this Lawrence was understood to intimate that such was his errand. The Vigilance Committee here, believing that such was the fact sent one of their number to keep him company. During this movement, the six travellers were "laying back" in comfortable quarters. Yesterday they spent a few hours in this city, delighted with what they saw and heard, and at the time of this writing are SAFE, under the protection of a government that does n't recognise property in man.

It seems that the cars of the Underground Railroad are so constructed that they run upon water as well as upon land—and it would seem farther, that the United States Marshal who takes a Fugitive from Northern Ohio, has got to be pretty smart.—*Cle

Miscellaneous Department.

SLAVERY AND SERFDOM IN RUSSIA.

Translated for The Evening Post from the Augsburg Allgemeine Zeitung.

SERFDOM began to be general in Russia only when it had begun to decline in the rest of Europe. There had always been servants (*cholop*) who were serfs. These were the descendants of persons who had been made prisoners of war, from the time of the domination of the Mongols. They were put to all kinds of labour, and were bought and sold. But the native peasantry (Krestianin) from time immemorial had been freemen, and, as Karamsin asserts, in the full enjoyment of civil liberty, but without the individual possession of personal property or inheritable real estate. The land was owned, not by the individuals, but by the whole community. It is true that the soil of the parish was, even in olden times, under the suzerainty of the lord; but the parish, or community, appropriated it for its own purposes, paying to the lord therefor only a tribute in money and labour, the amount of which was every year determined by mutual agreement or contract. The lands belonging exclusively to the lord were cultivated by his own slaves—the house or court menials.

This constitution of a parish or community was *de facto* a social republic, each member of which had an equal share in the common wealth. The prairies and arable lands were divided equally among the tillers of the soil, and the inequality of fortunes was prevented by the prohibition of inheritance. Wood and water, hunting and fishing grounds were left undivided, but their use was not controlled by the will of a single person, and from time to time they also were subjected to equal division, as the wants of the community required. The administration of government was patriarchal, like that of a family. The magistrate, who was at the head of the community, was called "father," and he shared the administration of affairs with a council styled the "Ancients." In the exercise of his authority, the "father" held great power over individuals, but none over the community. His authority was constantly limited and restrained by the "Ancients," whose votes controlled all his public acts; but the supreme power was vested in the whole community. The division of lands and the assessment of taxes were decided in public meetings, which also checked the excesses of the magistrate, and in extreme cases even ordained his deposition. In these meetings every taxpayer was entitled to vote.

This liberal constitution existed both before and after the domination of the Tartars, but under the rule of the Czars its provisions of liberality towards the peasants were gradually diminished, and, at last, totally annihilated. This was the beginning of the enslavement of the masses, and it led to successive aggressions, ending in the complete usurpation of the soil by the wealthy nobles.

Russian serfdom, as it now exists, was first established at the close of the sixteenth century. Shortly before, an outbreak of revolutionary anarchy induced the Czar, Boris Godunow, to promulgate an ukase, prohibiting the free transit of the peasants from one community to another. This free migration of the peasantry diminished the income of the lower nobility of the empire, who could not offer the same inducements to the peasants, as the greater lords—the princes, bojards and clergy—and as the power of the crown lay principally in the services of these small land-owners, the Czar was interested to prevent their impoverishment. An ukase, dated in the year 1593, took from the peasants, who were at this period under contract, the right of migration, and required them to remain on those lands where their contracts were registered on the last St. George's day. This was an act of undisguised robbery and oppression. The peasantry thenceforward became fixtures of the soil, the property of the lord, and consequently inheritable. Such was the original establishment of serfdom in Russia.

The first consequence of this act of piracy was an attempt, on the part of the enslaved, to evade the law. Those who had, from their own free will, made engagements for a certain length of time, endeavoured, after the expiration of their contract, by the payment of taxes and by the repayment of the contract loan, to free themselves. In order to put a stop to the quarrels and litigation to which these efforts gave rise, another ukase was proclaimed in the year 1597, which prohibited the repayment, by the peasants, of any money for the purpose of freeing themselves, and directed all peasants who had served without a written contract to sell themselves to those lords whom they had served, for the period of six months. Those only who had served for a shorter period were permitted to choose their own masters. These arbitrary measures so exasperated the peasants that they broke out in open revolt, which could only be suppressed by armed intervention. Thus were the peasants of Russia despoiled of their liberty.

St. George's Day has ever since that time been regarded as an unlucky day—a day of public calamity—by the Russian peasantry, and to this day, in the melancholy strains of many Russian songs, the "Juriews" day is referred to as that disastrous day when liberty was taken from them, and they were all made unhappy slaves.

The sudden restriction upon the freedom of emigration was found, in an economical point of view, to injure the very class it was intended to benefit. Scarcity of labour in some localities, and superabundance in others, were the natural results; and to remedy these evils, an ukase was promulgated in 1601, so modifying its predecessors as to permit the serfs of small land-owners to change their places of residence under certain restrictions. The institution of soil serfdom naturally enough effected a complete social revolution, but, strictly considered, it was as yet only a *half* serfdom. Peter the Great completed the iniquity. Until his time the lord exercised a property power over only his *house* menials; but now the peasants were reduced to the same grade with the menials. Previously, the peasants could not be separated from the soil, nor driven indiscriminately to every kind of labour; now, they were placed under the absolute control of their masters, and their persons were declared to be saleable property.

By this act Peter the Great not only destroyed the power of the nobility and clergy, but annihilated the last shadow of freedom which had remained to the peasantry. Having robbed the aristocracy of their political power, he sought to indemnify them by giving the peasantry absolutely into their power. In carrying out his views, with unheard of cruelty, he displaced the inhabitants of whole villages, and compelled them to embrace new occupations. Some communities he gave *en masse* to foreign manufacturers, and obliged them to labour in factories. The nobility followed the example of their Imperial master, and, considering the persons of their serfs as valuable merchandise, hired them for stipulated sums and certain periods to foreign speculators, and in this manner the system of hiring (*obrok*) was developed.

That the free communal institutions of the peasantry should be shattered by this system of hiring follows as a matter of course; and during the eighteenth century the fruits of their overthrow became apparent. The national habits were demoralized, agriculture was despised by the peasants as degrading, and was consequently neglected. Since the peasants had been reduced from freemen to the condition of slaves, the rivalries of industry were no longer attractive; a degree of stolidity manifested itself, and, in order to forget the gloomy past and the hopeless future, they resorted to the momentary consolation of intoxicating liquors. Drunkenness became a national characteristic, and, under its influence, the morals of the nation rapidly degenerated. A further evil of the hiring system was that it awakened in the nation a desire for a nomadic life—for trading and swindling. In many cases, serfs thus hired out returned comparatively wealthy to their places of birth. The primitive simplicity of this hospitable people was thus destroyed, and envy, with a host of kindred bad passions, corrupted their hearts, and made them discontented with their lot.

It must be confessed that their situation was indeed horrible. Russian serfdom is worse than slavery in America, and might well require the pen of a Beecher Stowe to delineate it truthfully. The peasant was not only attached to the soil during his natural life, but was prohibited from ever changing his residence, his occupation, or his master. He was entirely at his master's pleasure, and might be torn from home and family, transported to distant regions, and perhaps sold to a worse master. Tyranny hardens the human heart, and will, in the end, extinguish the last spark of kindly sympathy. The reform of the army, which made the nobility responsible for a certain number of soldiers, influenced in a great measure the cruelties perpetrated by the nobles against the serfs. Everything seemed to conspire against the poor serf, while nothing was done to alleviate his physical or mental wrongs. In him the right of a living soul was not recognised. All the aspirations of his soul were crushed down; he was not even permitted to feel as a man, or as a citizen, as a father, or as a child; he was estimated and dandied precisely as a chattel—an anvil or hammer—as a lifeless log, or insensible tool. At the present time a serf is valued at ten roubles per annum, though he often earns from thirty to forty roubles for his master.

In some parts of Russia serfdom was introduced at a later period, as in Lesser Russia, where the Empress Elizabeth, to gratify the rapacity of her favourite Rasumowski, presented to him 50,000 free peasants, reducing them at once, by a despotic ukase, to mere serfs. Other parts annexed by conquest to the empire at a still later period, like Finland, were permitted to retain their national institutions, and serfdom was therefore not introduced, because it never existed in this country. The inhabitants of Finland, called Odnodworzes, were free and independent peasants, acknowledging no masters, and paying only a certain amount of taxes and labour to the crown. They were the descendants of nobles, who, for some offence, were exiled to these distant regions by Peter and his predecessors, and being stripped of all other privileges, retained only that of freedom of the body. Though they in all other respects, in the lapse of time degenerated to the condition of the serfs of Russia, they yet retained a certain pride of their freedom, and regarded a marriage with a serf as an unpardonable *mésalliance*. A further check to serfdom was offered in the army system, which created another aristocracy in the lower classes, because all men who had served in the army became freemen.

But these small impediments did not diminish the miseries of serfdom in Russia, they were merely exceptions to the rule, and a more severe blow was needed to affect seriously the system of Peter the Great. This blow was at last struck by Alexander I., whose liberal tendencies induced him to promote the emancipation of the serfs. He at first contemplated a general and sudden abolition of slavery, believing that this measure would advance the social well-being and security of the empire. Alexander deserves credit for his sentiments of humanity, as his letter to a magnate of his empire will show. A nobleman having, for some services rendered, solicited the donation of a large estate, he replied as follows: "The peasants of Russia are already nearly all slaves, and I will not be an instrument of the further degradation and misery growing out of such on institution. I, therefore, wish not to see their numbers increased, and I have made it my rule not to give any more peasants as property; the estate shall be given to you, but under the express condition, that the peasant shall not be sold like cattle."

Alexander soon discovered the necessity of abandoning the idea of sudden emancipation and adopting the slow method of successive reforms. A ukase first appeared forbidding the selling of serfs, without the soil, and with this measure soil serfdom was reëstablished. The next step was the ukase of February 20th, 1803, creating a class of free peasants. This law had the following provisions:

1. That all free men might acquire and hold real estate, wherever they pleased; until this period they could only be officials, or merchants of a city.

2. That all those liberated peasants, who had received, under certain conditions, land from their masters should have power to convey, bequeath, or transmit such lands.

Alexander next ameliorated the condition of the crown serfs, fearing to endanger the nobility by a sudden liberation. He fixed their taxes and socages, and reinstituted their primitive communal institutions. That these privileges of the crown serfs embittered the private serfs against their masters, who were opposed to such humane and lenient measures, will readily be imagined. The idea of emancipation was, for this reason, abandoned by the Emperor during his war with Napoleon I. At the conclusion of the war, however, Alexander resumed his philanthropic undertaking. The nobility of the Baltic provinces seemed to sympathize with the Emperor, and he tried a noble experiment, which proved successful. A ukase from the 16th of May, 1816, abolished serfdom in Eithland, and a year later a ukase from the 25th of August, 1817, emancipated the serfs of Courland. The nobility of Livland presented a petition to the Emperor, in March, 1819, praying for similar action, which was immediately sanctioned, and thenceforth all the peasantry of the Baltic provinces became free men, though without the power to hold real estate.

These experiments created a greater sensation in the empire than the Emperor had anticipated. The nobility opposed every measure towards the emancipation of their serfs, and even menaced the Emperor with revolt. Here, unfortunately, the courageous perseverance of the Emperor failed, and only single instances of emancipation on the crown lands were afterwards proclaimed. The peasants, seeing their hopes of freedom thus vanishing away, towards the close of the year 1824, broke out in open revolt in several provinces. The Dowager-Empress, then travelling in the Province of Novgorod, was forcibly retained by the peasants, and petitions were presented to her, demanding alleviation "of their crushing burdens." The Empress, intimidated, referred them to the Emperor, who was following his mother. As soon as the Emperor approached, the peasants knelt before his horses and carriage, and thus forced Alexander to hear their petition. This audacity excited the wrath of the Emperor, and, with angry words, he handed the paper back to the peasants. He told them, however, that he "would reflect on their petition"; but never returned an answer. This treatment from the Czar excited the peasants to rise in arms, and the revolt was put down by force. The nobles then became more tyranical than ever. Hundreds of serfs were sent to the mines of Siberia by their masters for trivial or imaginary offences, and generally such persons were selected who, either from age or sickness, had become unable to work. They were torn from their families, banished as criminals to Siberia, or died under the application of the knout. The cruelties of the nobility hardly knew bounds, and at last called imperatively for reform.

Nicholas, as soon as he was seated firmly on the throne, began to devise measures of redress. Daily, the Emperor received thousands of petitions from the serfs, begging for relief.

This called forth the ukase of May, 18th, 1826, which said: "The Emperor, being aware that certain rumours have been spread by malicious persons, calculated abominably to deceive the simple minds of the peasants for purposes of personal advantage, commands hereby, under the most severe penalties, that all peasants pay without murmur their taxes, and render their lawful labour." In the meantime, Nicholas instructed the nobility "not to overwork" the peasants, and not to treat them "with too much rigour." But these measures were found insufficient. The badly-paid authorities could easily be bribed by the nobles, and, in 1827, an ukase ordered that the authority of the local magistrates should no longer suffice to transport a criminal to Siberia, but that the permission of the Governor-General should first be obtained; also, that this punishment should not be inflicted upon persons over fifty years of age, and in no case should a father be separated from his children under five years of age. This law rendered abuses less frequent, but the work of emancipation had scarcely progressed. Of nearly 45,000,000 of serfs, only 24,344 had been freed in the space of six years—from 1824 until 1830.

At last Nicholas issued a ukase, declaring the crown serfs "free men." The number of serfs was by this one act diminished forty per/cent. The Czar then turned his attention to the purchase of private estates, annexing them to those of the crown, and thus freeing the serfs. Nearly half of Great Russia came in this manner into the possession of the crown. In consequence of this large increase of the crown estates, a separate ministry was, in January, 1838, instituted for their government, independent of the Ministry of Finance which had previously controlled them. Since that time the condition of the peasantry has been dependent upon the will of this ministry; and though they are called "free men," yet they are forbidden to change their residence or their occupation without special permission first obtained, and they are often wronged and plundered by the government officials.

Nevertheless, the crown peasants, to a certain extent, govern themselves. In each department, at the time of the elections of the nobles, they send two delegates to the "Tribunal of Conscience"; one of these delegates is, at the same time, a member of the college of "Public Charity." They also elect a "Zewski," or overseer of the local police. The elections of these officers take place once in three years in every district or department, and for each five hundred house or landowners a delegate is sent. The electors must be men of family, at least thirty years of age, and of a respectable character. The elections require to be confirmed by the governors of the respective provinces. In every community are also elected local officers, as the Sotski, for three years, and the Dessiatskis every month. Besides, in every village of ten houses, officials are chosen who bear the titles of Ancients of the village, mayor, tax-collector, inspector of the flour magazines, wood keepers, justices of the peace, fire-wardens, &c. All candidates for these offices must be at least twenty-five years of age, and all discharged soldiers are eligible.

In Siberia the election of the crown peasants takes place every year, through delegates, one for each hundred. The offices in the gift of the peasants are here more confined—for each district only a Mayor, Warden and Secretary, and for each of the villages the Ancients and Dessiatskis. The peasants of Siberia, as well as of the Caucasus, do not send delegates to the tribunals, the Crown reserving the privilege of appointing them.

All these changes have modified, in a great measure, those primitive institutions which Alexander I. desired to see reëstablished, and particularly the introduction of military colonies proposed by count Alraktscheiefs. But we must at the same time confess, that the condition of the Crown peasants became daily more comfortable, and naturally aroused the envy and animosity of the private serfs towards their masters. In 1840 there remained 30,000,000 of private serfs and 20,000,000 of Crown peasants. That something must be done to redress the wrongs of these private serfs, Nicholas well knew, yet he still delayed action, and it was only in 1842, on the 2d of April, that he issued his ukase authorizing the nobility to emancipate their serfs in any way agreeable to both parties.

The ministerial recript to the different chiefs of departments read as follows:

"You receive herewith the ukase of the second of April, with the conditions which permit the nobility to conclude contracts for the emancipation of their serfs at their good pleasure; it contains *de facto* nothing new, and it adds only a few rules to the prescriptions of 1803. It is not, therefore, necessary to give a new interpretation to this ukase. His majesty the Emperor has ordered me to communicate this his will to the military and civil governors, and to command them, first, to take the necessary precautions that no false rumours may be circulated regarding the so-called freedom of the peasants; secondly, to direct their attention to the careful surveillance of the peasants, that they may be obedient to the lawful authority of their masters."

The effects of this ukase could be easily predicted. The nobility opposed to emancipation declined to make any engagements with their serfs, on the ground that a serf was merely a piece of merchandize, with which negotiation was impossible.

The emancipation of these unfortunate people, was, therefore, again postponed to an indefinite period. Several revolts in all parts of the empire were the natural consequences, unheard-of cruelties were often perpetrated. The ministerial reports acknowledged the murder of from sixty to seventy nobles, who had been slain by their serfs. Even in the Baltic provinces, where the peasants had been freed, but without the privilege of possessing the land they occupied, great excesses were committed. A Baltic baron, in one of the meetings of the nobles, declared openly that "the Emperor need only give permission to the peasants to kill the nobles, and to-morrow we should all be slain on our manors." The 12th of June, 1844, saw another ukase issued, which made a distinction between the house menials and peasants, and held the government officials responsible for the better treatment of the latter. The census of the year 1844, showed that there were yet over 30,000,000 of peasants held in bondage by 109,340 nobles, though very unequally divided. Of those 30,000,000 of serfs only 10,704,378 were taxed, belonging to about 88,000 nobles, who possessed from one to ten serfs each. There were 17,712 nobles, who held from 10 to 500; 3,791 had more than 500, and five nobles owned 20,000 or more.

The following years, 1845 and 1846, were equally happy in adding to the measures for the amelioration of the serfs; but it was reserved for the ukase of the 20th of November, 1847, to inaugurate the most important measures in favour of the peasantry, and the consequent overthrow of the tyranny of the nobility. This ukase decreed that communities advertised for public sale, on account of their masters' debts, could acquire the estates for themselves and their heirs. That such cases occurred only when communities were nearly beggared by their masters, need not be stated; but notwithstanding all obstacles, the results of this ukase were most astonishing. Wherever such a sale was advertised the community acquired it, and it was often a mystery where the necessary means were obtained. In time the riddle was explained. Communities, without previous legal authority, had quietly formed associations of the nature of assurance companies, for their special emergencies, and when the poor communities without means were to be sold, the wealthier ones lent them the money to purchase their independence.

That the Emperor Nicholas had the tact to choose the right moment for the inauguration of a great measure, nobody acquainted with his character will deny. Scarcely had the news of the French February revolution reached St. Petersburg, when a new ukase appeared, dated March 15th, 1848, granting to the serfs individually the right to acquire real estate. The Muscovite press, and even that of Western Europe, applauded this ukase as a step leading directly to the complete emancipation of the peasants. But though it granted to the peasants the power to hold real estate, it provided expressly that it should only be by the special permission of the lord, and without the right to hold serfs. This was a fatal restriction.

It affords a deep and interesting study for the politician to trace out, step by step, the manifold windings of the domestic policy of Russia. Now the Czar proclaims a ukase granting a few privileges to serfdom, and again another appears designed to appease the jealousy of the rapacious nobles; and still through all, by slow yet sure gradations, the manifest destiny of the institution of serfdom approaches with steady, resistless march. The revolutions of 1848 and 1849, and the succeeding European reaction naturally retarded the progress of emancipation. At the commencement of the Turkish war, when a coalition of all Europe was feared by Russia, and circumstances imperiously demanded the development of her entire and united national strength, the work of serf emancipation was again forwarded by the Emperor.

The year 1854 saw the birth of another ukase, which forbade the lease of all estates to which serfs were attached. This law was evidently intended to compel the proprietors to sell their estates in cases where they would prefer to lease them, and to offer to the communities, or single individuals, opportunities to gain their freedom. But it is clear that this ukase is yet by no means the last steps towards serf emancipation, and that the liberty of the peasantry is yet in its infancy. Runaway serfs, though they may have been fugitives more than ten years, must still be delivered up to their masters. If a serf is killed without premeditation, the murderer is only required to pay 600 silver roubles to his master. The serf who works on account of his master has three days in the week for himself, and ordinarily from three to four acres of land, a hut, working implements and cattle—all his own property, and even the most avaricious of masters respects the personal property of his serfs. The freed communities have all the days for themselves, and pay by contract only a certain stipulated amount for the use of the soil, still in the usurped possession of the lord. In return, the proprietor pays annually about eight francs as a personal or poll-tax for each serf. If quarrels arise among the serfs, the lord gives judgment and dictates the punishments, which must, however, be limited to banishment to Siberia, or to enlistment into the army. The proprietor is entitled to change the residence of his serfs from one place to another at his pleasure, regardless of distance, but may not separate families, and is obliged to protect them from penury. The serfs are not permitted to possess real estate; their lands and houses belong to their masters. Serfs who are crippled by their masters are under the protection of Government. Serfs, with the permission of their masters, can, for a limited time, become manufacturers, merchants, &c. Only hereditary nobles can possess serfs; and landless nobles are not permitted to buy them. Serfs who come into possession of non-Christian owners, are free by paying four silver roubles and fifty kopeks. A serf who can convict his master of high treason, receives his freedom, and that of his family, from the Government.

The Government prohibits the instruction of serfs; they are only permitted to receive a common school education when they are emancipated; and their children cannot be admitted to commercial or military schools, colleges or universities; and are thereby excluded from a higher education.

This is the situation of the Russian serfs at the present day. Although they constitute the substantial basis of the State, yet they are placed almost beyond the pale of society. Although purposely degraded by the Government, they are, nevertheless, not made effeminate and continue to maintain their self-respect. To oppression they oppose cunning, and are thoroughly imbued with the belief that the soil rightfully belongs to them, that they do not belong to any master, and that no man can be the property of another.

It is obvious that, with such a degradation of the peasantry, agriculture must remain in corresponding degradation. Nevertheless it would be unjust to deny that, since the desperate acts of Peter the Great, who robbed the peasantry of all their rights, a wholesome reaction has set in, which can only terminate in the total emancipation of the serfs. It would also be unjust to deny that Russia has progressed in civilization during the present century. If Russia had not had railroads covering her immense territories the expedition to the Crimea could not have been carried out, or would have resulted very differently. Russia has been taught a lesson, the beautiful results of which will appear in the advancement of her civilization and the final emancipation of all the oppressed within her dominions.

THE SANDHILLERS.

BETWEEN the "low country" and the "upper country" of South Carolina, lies the middle or sandhill region. A large portion of this tract, which varies in breadth from ten to thirty miles, is covered with forests of pine, interspersed here and there with a variety of other trees. Where it is under cultivation, the principal crop is cotton. But the land is not generally fertile, and much of it is likely to remain for a long time a partial wilderness.

The country itself presents few interesting features, but it is the home of a singular race or class of people, to whom I may profitably devote a few paragraphs of description.

In travelling through the "middle country" I often passed the rude and squalid cabins of the sandhillers. All the inmates usually flocked to the door of their windowless *domicile* to stare at me. And such a lank, scrawny, filthy set of beings I never beheld elsewhere—not even within the *purlieus* of the Five Points! Their complexion is a ghastly yellowish white, without the faintest tinge of wholesome red. The hair of the adults is generally sandy, and that of the children nearly as white as cotton. The children are even paler, if possible, than the adults, and often painfully haggard and sickly looking. They are entirely uneducated, semi-barbarous in all their habits, very dull and stupid, and, in general social position, far below the slave population around them. In fact the negro looks down upon them with mingled pity and contempt. They are "squatters" on lands belonging to others, either with or without their consent. They sometimes cultivate, or rather plant, a small patch of ground near their cabins, raising a little corn and a few cabbages, melons, and sweet potatoes. Their agricultural operations never extend beyond this. Corn-bread, pork, cabbage (fried in lard), and whiskey, seem to be their principal articles of diet. To procure the latter and the few clothes they require, they make shingles, or baskets, or gather pine knots and wild berries, which they sell in the village; but beyond what is required to supply their very limited actual necessities, they will not work. Their principal employments are hunting and fishing, and their standard amusements drinking whiskey and fighting. Their dress is as primitive as their habits. The women and children invariably go bare-footed and bare-legged, their only garment apparently, being a gown of calico. The men wear a cotton shirt, and trowsers of the coarse homespun cloth of the country, with the addition sometimes of an upper garment too rude and shapeless to be named or described.

I one day met a migrating family of these miserable people. On a most sorry, lank, and almost fleshless substitute for a horse, were packed the entire household effects of the family, consisting of a bed and a few cooking utensils. Two small children occupied the top of the pack. Two larger ones, each loaded with a bundle, trudged behind with their mother, who appeared to be scarcely more than seventeen years of age. The father, a wild, sinister-looking fellow, walked a little in advance of the rest, with his long rifle on his shoulder and his hunting pouch at his side.

A correspondent of one of the city dailies thus describes an encounter with a sandhill family:

"Here, on the road, we meet a family who have been to town. A little girl of ten years old, with a coarse old fragment of a dress on, is sitting on the backbone of a moving skeleton of a horse, which has the additional task of trailing along a rickety specimen of a wagon, in which is seated a man—a real outside squalid barbarian, mandlin and obfuscated with bald-faced whiskey, with a child of four or five years old at his side. Behind this, a haggard-looking boy upon another skeleton of a horse is coming. What an odd, outlandish, low-wheeled cart the horse is pulling! There sits the old woman and her grown-up daughter, with nothing on apparently, except a very dirty bonnet and a coarse and dirty gown. The daughter has a basket by her side, and the old woman holds fast to a suspicious-looking stone-jug of half a gallon measure, corked with a corncob. Your life on it, that is a jug of whiskey. The family have been to the village, with a couple of one-horse loads of pine knots used for light wood. They have probably sold them for a dollar, half of which has doubtless gone for whiskey, and now they are getting home. Degraded as they are, you see it is the man who is helpless, and the woman who has to take care of the jug, and conduct the important expedition. There are hundreds of such people dispersed through these sandhills. You see the whole of this party are bare-legged and bare-footed. And how bony and brown they are! And it is a curious fact, that in temperate countries, the children of all semi-barbarous white people (except Sir Henry Bulwer's black-headed or red-headed Celts), and all Anglo-Saxon backwoods, or mountain, or prairie people have cotton-headed or flaxen-headed children."

Low indeed is the lowest class of white people in the Southern States, though nowhere else have I found them quite so degraded as in South Carolina. "Poor buckrah," "poor white folks," are the terms by which the negro designates them; and "poor" means a great deal in this connection. It includes not simply pecuniary poverty, but ignorance, boorishness, and general social degradation. The Southern negro never applies the term poor to any one who has the manners and bearing of a gentleman, however light his purse. "Poor white man" is a being whom he looks down upon—an object of pity or contempt.—*Life Illustrated.*

MAN TO MAN.

STAND up, man! stand!
God's over all.
Why do you cringe to me,
Why do you bend the knee,
And creep, and fawn, and crawl?
Stand up, man, stand!
If I thought our English land
Had no true-hearted poor,
To suffer—and endure—
And hold themselves erect,
In the light of their own respect,
I'd blush that I was English born,
And run away to the wilderness to free
myself from scorn.

Stand up, man, stand!
God made us all!
The wine transcends the froth—
The living skin, the cloth—
Both rich and poor are small.
Stand up, man, stand!
Free heart, free tongue, free hand,
Firm foot upon the sod,
And eyes that fear but God—
Whate'er your state or name,
Let these prefer your claim!
If there be anything you want—
Speak up! we may respect a churl, but
we hate a sycophant.

From Mackay's "Lump of Gold and other Poems."

THE MIGHTY CEDARS OF CALIFORNIA.

THE Rev. Dr. Bushnell, of Hartford, Ct., writes from California to the New York *Independent* an interesting account of the immense cedars of California, the largest trees in the world. One of them, which had been felled, he ascertained, by counting the layers of the stump, to be twelve hundred and eighty years old. We copy an extract:

"It is forest, yet nothing that we mean by forest. There is no under ground, scarcely anywhere a rock; the surface is as beautifully turned as if shaped by a landscape gardener, and dotted all over by myriads of flowers, more delicate, if not more various than any garden ever grew. Moving along these surfaces, rounding over a hill, or galloping through some silent valley, winding here among the native oaks casting their round shadows, and here among tall pines and cedars drawing their huge conical shapes on the ground, we seem, in fact, to be riding through some vast park. Indeed, after we had seen the trees and taken their impression, we could think of nothing but to call it park of the Lord Almighty. The other trees we observed were increasing in size as we neared the place, till finally, descending gently along a western slope among the files of little giants, we came to the gate of the real giants, emerging into the cleared ground of the Big Tree Hotel between the two sentinels which are 500 feet high, and stand only far enough apart for the narrow road to pass between. These were the first of the Washington cedars we had seen; it really seemed that we had never seen a tree before. And yet they were only medium specimens.

"Close by the house lay the first cut of the big tree *par eminence*; the remaining part, or top, had been split up and removed. Near this first cut stood the stump, about six feet high, with an arbour mounted on the top, which had been squared down for this purpose, the posts of the arbour standing out in the line of the largest circuit at the ground, and the space between them and the circuit of the top filled by a floor of short boards. The diameter of the top is by measurement twenty-five feet one way, and twenty-three and one-half feet the other. The diameter at the ground, was thirty-one feet. They are all included in a space of fifty acres, and are only about ninety in number. The ground occupied is a rich, wet bottom, and the foot of a moist northern slope adjacent, covered also with an undergrowth. And why are they here, just here, and nowhere else? This, I confess, is to me the greatest, strangest wonder of all, and nowhere in the whole earth is there another known example of these Anakims of the forest; ninety seeds alone have been started, ninety and no more. Is there, was there no other piece of ground but just this, in the whole world, that could fitly take the seeds of such a growth? Why have they never spread; why has no one seed of the myriads that sprinkle every year on the earth, ever started in any other locality?

"And what a starting it is, when such a seed of life begins to grow. Little did that tiny form of matter, about the size of a parsnip seed, and looking more like it than any other, imagine what it was going to do, what feelings to excite when it started the first sproutings of the big tree! We measured an enormous sugar pine recently felled. Sixty feet from the ground it was six feet in diameter, and it was 240 feet high. We measured one of the prostrate giants, and 240 feet from the ground it was six feet in diameter. The top was gone, but it could not have been less than 350 feet high. And yet this tree was only eighteen feet in diameter where the big tree was twenty-five. If the big tree were hollowed, one might drive the largest load of hay through it without even a brush of contact.

"Many of the trees, and all the largest of them that remain, are greatly injured by fire. Their time is therefore shortened, and a long time will be required to bring the smaller ones to their maximum of growth. A man instigated by the infernal love of money, should have cut down the biggest of them, and skinned the next 120 feet upwards from the ground (viz: the mother), that he might show or sell the bark of her body, both sound as a rock at the heart, and good for a thousand years to come. O, it surpasses all contempt! And yet to see this Great Mother still growing up as before, bearing her fresh foliage, ripening her seeds, and refusing to die; hiding still her juices and working h pumps in the deep masses of her barkless body, which the sun of two whole years has not been able to season through, dead as it is and weather-cracked without—it is a sight so grand as almost to compensate for the loss we suffer by the baseness of the human scamp."

DE FOE AND THE GHOST THAT MADE THE BOOK SELL.

AN adventurous bookseller had ventured to print a considerable edition of Drelincourt's *Book of Consolation against the Fears of Death*, translated by M. D'Assigny. But, however certain the prospect of death, it is not so agreeable (unfortunately) as to invite the eager contemplation of the public, and the book, being neglected, lay a dead stock on the hands of the publisher. In this emergency he applied to De Foe to assist him in rescuing the unfortunate book from the literary death to which general neglect seemed about to consign it. De Foe's genius and audacity devised a plan, which, for assurance and ingenuity, defied even the power of Mr. Puff in the *Critic*; for who but himself would have thought of summoning up a ghost from the grave to bear witness in favour of a halting body of divinity? There is a matter-of-fact, business-like style in the whole account of the transaction, which bespeaks ineffable powers of self-possession. The apparition of Mrs. Veal is represented as appearing to a Mrs. Bargrave, her intimate friend, as she sat in her own house in deep contemplation of certain distresses of her own. After the ghostly visitor had announced herself as prepared for a distant journey, her friend and she began to talk in the homely style of middle-aged ladies, and Mrs. Veal proses concerning the conversations they had formerly held, and the books they had read together. Her very recent experience probably led Mrs. Veal to talk of death and the books written on the subject, and she pronounced, *ex cathedra*, as a dead person was best entitled to do, that "Drelincourt's book on death was the best book on the subject ever written." She also mentioned Dr. Sherlock, two Dutch books which had been translated, and several others; but Drelincourt, she said, had the clearest notions of death and the future state of any who had handled that subject. She then asked for the work, and lectured on it with great eloquence and affection. Dr. Kenrick's *Ascetick* was also mentioned with approbation by this critical spectre (the Doctor's work was no doubt a tenant of the shelf in some favourite publisher's shop) and Mr. Norris's poem on *Friendship*, a work which, I doubt, though honoured with the ghost's approbation, we may now seek for as vainly as Corelli tormented his memory to recover the sonata which the devil played to him in a dream. The whole account is so distinctly circumstantial, that were it not for the impossibility, or extreme improbability at least, of such an occurrence, the evidence could not but support the story.

The effect was most wonderful. Drelincourt upon *Death*, attested by one who could speak from experience, took an unequalled run. The copies had hung on the bookseller's hands as heavy as a pile of bullets. They now traversed the town in every direction, like the same balls discharged from a field-piece. In short, the object of Mrs. Veal's apparition was perfectly attained.—*Scott's Memoir of De Foe.*

Gleanings from Foreign Publications.

Mr. W. M. Thackeray has a new work of fiction in progress, to be published in monthly parts.

——Mr. Reade, whose "Peg Woffington" and "Christie Johnstone" met with so much popular favour, is about to publish, through Mr. Bentley, a new romance, entitled "Never Too Late to Mend."

——Theodore Hook said to an alderman who had already surfeited him, and yet pressed him to partake of still another course, "I thank you; but if it's the same to you, I'll take the rest in money."

——According to a Milan newspaper, the Rev. Father Secchi, Director of the Observatory at Rome, has succeeded in taking photographs of the moon, and amongst them one in which the mouth of the volcano Copernicus is distinctly represented.

——Daniel Dancer, when he had £3,000 a year, used to beg a pinch of snuff from all his friends, and when his box was full, bartered its contents for a tallow candle. But his parsimonious ingenuity appears contemptible in comparison with that of the Russian miser, who learned to bark that he migh avoid the expense of keeping a dog.

——George III. appears in a little anecdote cherished among the Moravians. On one occasion, the King, who liked a joke, said, in his dry way, "Mr. Hutton, I am told that you Moravians do not select your own wives, but leave it to your ministers to choose for you—is it so?" "Yes, please your Majesty; marriages amongst the Brethren are contracted, as your Majesty will perceive, after the fashion of royalty."

——SHAKSPEARE'S HOUSE.—The long-talked-of gift of £500 by Mr. John Shakspeare, Langley Priory, near Ashby-de-la-Zouch, has been made over to trustees, for the purpose of purchasing certain property on each side Shakspeare's House, and restoring that portion of the premises known as the Swan and Maidenhead to its original state. In the completion of this work, it is intended to remove whatever does not form an integral part of "the house" property on the White Lion side, and also Mr. Gill's house in the opposite direction. Mr. John Shakspeare contemplates some further donation in aid of the proposed improvements and restorations.

——FAITHFUL PREACHING.—It is related of Dr. Wilson, the bishop of Calcutta, that he once, at the close of his sermon, pointed out and named several respectable merchants in his congregation, particularizing the sums they would no doubt give, along with himself and the Hon. E. I. Company, towards the object for which he was pleading, namely, the liquidation of a debt on a beautiful little church recently built near Calcutta. On another occasion the bishop was preaching in the old church of Calcutta, when, having occasion to allude to that propensity to "overreach" which characterizes almost all classes, he pointed to a clergyman in the desk below him, and said, "Now, there's ——; he's a regular screw, for he sold me a horse the other day for twice as many rupees as it was worth."

——A VILLAGE OF WOMEN.—The following account appears in the *Augsburg Gazette:* The village of Madana, which is about sixty English miles from Rutschued in Wallachia, offers at the present moment a curious ethnographical singularity, having been inhabited by women only for the last thirty years. At one period this female population was two hundred. The ladies did not live like warriors like the Amazons of old, but avoided all intercourse with men, and drove away from their territories all who appeared with matrimonial intention. The anti-social settlement is now supposed to be on the decline; at least no more recruits are made from the disappointed or the love-crossed, and the members of the population are rapidly decreasing.

——The London correspondent of the British *Advertiser* tells the following anecdote of the Queen: A rather remarkable picture is now being exhibited in Piccadilly, the production, I believe, of a Mr. Bartlett, curious enough, a Quaker. It is a representation of the visit of the Queen and royal family to the wounded Crimean soldiers at the Brompton Hospital. It is said that this picture was taken at a rather curious moment. The Queen was standing, with tears in her eyes, talking to a poor fellow who had got sadly shattered in battle. Prince Albert stood impassive and unmoved. The royal mistress, who is a genuine woman, was mortified by his vacant and unfeeling look, and petulantly said to him, her voice still quivering with sympathy, "Do say something to the man, and not stand staring in that way."

——*Mr. Punch* (in speaking of life insurance (has no objection to the most scrutinizing inquiries being made before a policy is granted; on the contrary, the more minute the investigation, the better. And since the twenty-five or thirty questions by which it is sought to discover the physiology of yourself and that of your father, mother, grandparents, uncles, aunts, cousins, brothers and sisters, is sufficient, he begs to frame a few more, conceived in the same spirit, which he would add to the "particulars required." Only he would insist, that when everything has been asked, and everything tested, the record should be closed, and the bargan, if made, should be irrevocable. For instance:

31. Did your great-grandmother ever complain of having been frightened to death?

32. Are you in the habit of reading Mr. Alison's Histories, or the *Morning Advertiser*, or any other publications, tending to lengthen life?

33. Do you cross the street carefully, and have you ever been run over by Pickford's vans, and how often?

34. Have you an admission to the Zoological Gardens, and if so, do you habitually go close to the dens of the *carnivora*, or get into the serpent's cages?

35. Is your wife a strong-minded woman?

36. Do you know any Americans, and is there any chance of your getting into political arguments with the owner of a revolver?

37. Are you a polite man, who does not mind running out of a hot Opera house to get up a carriage on a wet night?

38. Did you ever sit out an Elizabethan drama of modern construction, and how many years ago, and who attended you, medically, afterwards?

39. Do you run after fancy preachers, and do they make you cry?

40. What was the general state of your ancestor's health, in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries?

41. Was any member of your family ever swallowed up by an earthquake?

42. When you go to gravesend, is it by boat or rail, and if in the former case, do you alway hold fast by a rope?

43. Do you always take care not to tread on orange-peel in the street?

44. Have you ever been afflicted with Irishmen or any other epidemic?

45. Who cuts your hair?

Now, let the office add these, and any number of similar questions, to their string of inquiries. And let them examine your friends on oath, and your doctor as the Americans cross-examine a nigger witness, namely, by putting him in a corner and kicking his shins until he answers categorically. And let them have half